

ЗАПИСЫ

БЕЛАРУСКИ ІНСТЫТУТ НАВУКІ І МАСТАЦТВА

BYELORUSSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

ZAPISY 17

NEW YORK 1983

ЗАПИСЫ

БЕЛАРУСКІ ІНСТЫТУТ НАВУКІ І МАСТАЦТВА

BYELORUSSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

ZAPISY 17

Proceedings
of the
Twenty-fifth Anniversary Symposium
of the
Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences
February 1977

Edited
by
Thomas E. Bird

NEW YORK 1983

Друкуецца пры фінансавай дапамозе Фундацыі
імя Пётры Крэчэўскага.

Published with the financial support of the Kreceuski Foundation, Inc.

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КАЛЕГІЯ: Антон Адамовіч, Томас Э. Бэрд,
Янка Запруднік, Вітаўт Кіпель, Вітаўт Тумаш, Антон Шукелойць.

EDITORIAL BOARD: Anthony Adamovich, Thomas E. Bird,
Vitaut Kipel, Anton Shukeloyts, Vitaut Tumash, Jan Zaprudnik.

Copyright © 1983 by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences
in the U.S.

ADDRESS: ZAPISY
230 Springfield Avenue
Rutherford, N.J. 07070 U.S.A.

Price per copy — \$ 20.00

Цана — 20 даляраў

УВАГА: Першыя 6 кніжак ЗАПІСАЎ былі выдадзеныя
ў гадох 1952 — 1954 у Нью Ёрку; пяць далейшых
у гадох 1962 — 1970 друкаваліся ў Мюнхэне, Нямеччына.
Ад кнігі 12-ае 1974 г. ЗАПІСЫ друкуюцца ізноў у Нью Ёрку.

NOTE: This volume is a continuation of the ZAPISY series which
began its publication in 1952. Volume 1 — 6 were published in
1952 — 1954 in New York; the following 5 volumes (1-5)
were printed 1962 — 1970 in Munich, Germany.
Beginning with vol. 12 (1974) the **Zapisy** are being published in
New York, U.S.A.

PRINTED BY:
ST SOPHIA PRESS OF THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH OF U. S. A
166 FIRST AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10009

CONTENTS

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

Thomas E. Bird.	5
------------------------	---

OPENING REMARKS

Vitaut Kipel.	7
----------------------	---

THE BYELORUSSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Vitaut Tumaš. The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in the United States: Twenty-five Years of Its Activities	9
Ivonka Survilla. The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in Canada: The Institute's Programs and Activities	15

LITERATURE

Stanislau Stankievich. The Forbidden Works of Janka Kupala	17
Olga Orechwa. The Poem, Symon Muzyka , by Jakub Kolas	27
Anthony Adamovich. Some Problems in the History of Byelorussian Literature	31
John Sadouski. Skaryna Studies in the West since World War II	35

LANGUAGE

George Y. Shevelov. Byelorussian-Ukrainian Contracts as Reflected in the Phonological Development of Ukrainian	43
--	----

THE FINE ARTS

Raisa Žuk-Hryskievič. The Visual Arts in Byelorussian Communities in the West	47
Uladzimier Symaniec. Artists from Byelorussia: The Paris School	63
Halina Rusak. Modern Byelorussian Art	69

MUSIC

Dimitri Weresow. Byelorussian Music Abroad	82
---	----

ARCHIVAL HOLDINGS

Patricia K. Grimsted. Archives and Manuscript Collections in the Belorussian SSR/Belorussian Geographical Names	85
---	----

HISTORY

Vitaut Kipel. The Early Byelorussian Presence in America	113
Jan Zaprudnik. Documentation of Byelorussia's Political History: 1917-1918	132

RELIGION

- Thomas E. Bird.** Orthodoxy in Byelorussia: 1917-1980 144

EDUCATION

- Valentyna Pashkievich.** The Teaching of the Byelorussian Language
in an English-Speaking Milieu 209
- Vasil Melianovich.** Byelorussian Studies in the Secondary
Schools and Community Colleges of Maryland 214

THE PRESS

- Uladzimier Bryleuski.** Attitudes in the Polish Press
towards Byelorussians 219

REVIEWS

227

CHRONICLE

- The Third Byelorussian Festival in the United States 236
- Scholarly and Artistic Events of 1979 239

- SUMMARIES OF ARTICLES IN BYELORUSSIAN 248

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

The papers in this volume were given at a symposium held at Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey in February 1977. New Jersey boasts the numerically largest and one of the most active Byelorussian communities of any state in the Union, drawing on extensive settlements from the Hrodna, Minsk, and Vilna Provinces of that country. It was thus appropriate that such an important milestone as the 25th anniversary of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences be celebrated in the Garden State. It was equally fitting for this gathering to have taken place at Seton Hall University which has long proffered valuable assistance to the ethnic communities of the region. The university has recently become the repository of ethnic archives for the State of New Jersey. The celebration of the anniversary and the academic presentations which were made received critical notice in the local, national, and international media.

The speakers dealt with many aspects of Byelorussian and Byelorussian-American life — language, literature, the fine arts, music, archival holdings, history, religion, education, and the press. The book is divided into ten sections, comprising eighteen articles. Ten deal with topics relating to Byelorussian activities outside the homeland; the remaining eight focus on life and culture in Byelorussia. The majority of authors have provided bibliographies with the most accessible current source or edition indicated wherever possible. Excepting a few data which required updating, the papers are reproduced here in the same form in which they were given. The original order of presentation, however, has been modified with an eye to providing a more logical and helpful grouping of topics.

The essays convey the vigor which abounds among Americans of Byelorussian descent in maintaining and developing their heritage in a wholesome, lively way, as well as in chronicling what has been accomplished to date. These pages limn an historical profile, wrestle with difficult, sometimes painful questions, and identify as yet unexplored areas.

Geographical terminology has been made editorially uniform by use of the spelling **Byelorussia** and **Byelorussian**, favored by the United Nations and most scholarly publications in the West. At their request, Dr. Patricia K. Grimsted and Professor George Shevelov have used the spelling **Belorussia** and **Belorussian**, pre-

ferred by the Library of Congress and some university presses.

It is the authors' and editor's hope that these essays will help focus attention on the variety and vitality of Byelorussian achievements both in the homeland and in the West.

For a wide variety of kinds of help I would like to express my indebtedness to Dr. Vitaut Kipel and Mrs. Zora Kipel, both members of the staff of the New York Public Library, and Dr. Jan Zaprudnik, whose enthusiasm, generosity, and knowledge helped to solve numerous puzzles in the process of editing these manuscripts.

Thomas E. Bird
Queens College, CUNY

N.B. A summary in Byelorussian of each article will be found at the end of this volume.

OPENING REMARKS

Vitaut Kipel

I feel honored to have the opportunity to thank Dr. John Tsu and Seton Hall University for their generosity in hosting our conference here today and for assisting us in so many ways in its preparation. As I say this, I know that I speak for all those present.

The occasion for this festive conference is the fact that the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences is 25 years old. This is, of course, a very brief period in the history of the Byelorussian people and their culture. What is twenty-five years when compared to scholarly institutions on Byelorussian soil which have existed for hundreds of years? Vilna University, for example, founded in 1579, has existed for four hundred years. Polatsk Academy, founded in 1580, functioned for over 200 years. Hory-Horki, founded in 1840, is nearly 140 years old. The Byelorussian State University in Minsk is almost 60 years old and the Academy of Sciences of the Byelorussian SSR is about to celebrate its fiftieth anniversary. But it is obviously not chronological age alone that counts. What is of importance are those features of the Institute which distinguish it from the other institutions mentioned.

Among these characteristics are the fact that this Institute is the first scholarly institution of its kind established outside of Byelorussian territory. This is a new and significant phenomenon in the history of the Byelorussian nation and of Byelorussian culture.

The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences is a scholarly institution which can freely express a variety of points of view about Byelorussian history, culture, art, music, and ideals.

In comparison with those scholarly institutions which exist in Soviet Byelorussia, the Byelorussian Institute in the United States defends the Byelorussian historical past without pressure, bias, or falsification. In this it is unique.

A free institution, the Institute, as part of its commitment, has established wide scholarly contacts with corresponding institutions of the Western world, providing assistance for many scholarly and academic projects carried on elsewhere. The Institute also developed extensive exchange programs with numerous libraries and research centers and took part in many conferences

and meetings dealing with Byelorussian and Slavonic studies. The variety of activities carried out by the Institute during the past 25 years is commendable. This is another important characteristic of the Institute.

In recounting all these facts, let me draw your attention to the following. Only 25 years ago we Byelorussians lacked the 7,000 pages of printed scholarly information about Byelorussia which are now the Institute's records for these two-and-one-half decades. These factographic and analytical data on various aspects of Byelorussian culture, history, and the arts constitute a valuable legacy. In many areas, especially in history, Byelorussian research generated by the Institute represents a truly pioneering effort. The Institute deserves high marks for the seriousness and depth of its revival of Skaryna studies, research on the history and activities of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, groundbreaking research on Byelorussian immigration, and analyses of many aspects of the historical and religious development of the Byelorussian nation.

It was not with the purpose of competing with the Academy of Sciences of the Byelorussian SSR that the Institute undertook its work, but its sense of moral obligation to the Byelorussian nation, which, under present conditions, is destined to experience unprecedented russification and the obliteration of its history. Scholarly institutions on Byelorussian soil are simply not permitted to engage in unfettered research on many of the topics addressed by members and other participants in the work of the Institute.

The last point which I would like to make this morning is of a rather personal nature. The foundation of the Institute, its organizational activities, and much of the direction and development of its programmatic work have been planned and carried out largely by one person, with whom a number of us have had the privilege to work for many years. It is no secret that this scholar, enthusiast, and gentleman is Dr. Vitaut Tumash. Although, Dr. Vitaut Tumash is deeply involved in a wide variety of Byelorussian activities, the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences is the organization to which Dr. Tumash devotes all his efforts, time and erudite knowledge. In fairness and truth it must be said plainly and forthrightly that the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences has been reached and can be celebrated today largely because of his selfless and long efforts.

THE BYELORUSSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES: TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF ITS ACTIVITIES

Vitaut Tumaš
President

The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences

The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences was founded 25 years ago with the purpose of bringing together scholars interested in the study of the past and present of Byelorussia. The need for such an organization in the United States was strongly felt after World War II, when a large number of Byelorussian intellectuals came to this country. Among them were teachers, writers, artists, scholars, and various professionals.

The idea of forming an organization with a scholarly profile was conceived as early as 1950. A year later, on December 16, 1951, a group of dedicated scholars and writers formed the organization under the name **Whiteruthenian Institute of Arts and Sciences**. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Vasil was elected the Institute's first president.

Two years later, on August 13, 1953, the Institute was incorporated in the State of New York as an organization whose activities cover the entire United States. Moreover, from its beginning the Institute has aimed at bringing into contact and organizing Byelorussian intellectuals from the entire Western world, and now, in addition to the United States, has members in Canada, Australia, and several European countries.

As the organization grew, its members in the Federal Republic of Germany decided to form their own chapter which was established on November 4, 1955, with Dr. Stanislaŭ Stankievič as president. Although chartered as an independent organization, the West German chapter remained in close cooperation with the Institute in New York. On September 17, 1967, a chapter of the Institute was formed in Canada. The Institute's activities and program fall, for the most part, into the following categories: regular scholarly meetings devoted to specific topics with papers presented by members or invited guests, academic conferences,

literary readings, author's evenings, exhibits, publications, and works devoted to Byelorussian bibliography.

During the past 25 years the Byelorussian Institute in the United States has organized and sponsored 202 meetings and exhibits with 180 papers presented or literary evenings sponsored. If the activities and programs of the West German and Canadian chapters of the Institute are included, the total number of scholarly meetings, exhibits, and presentations of papers comes to 239. Of that number, the Institute in the United States organized 202, that in West Germany 12, and that in Canada 25. A total of 57 scholars and writers have presented their papers or read their literary works, and 21 artists have exhibited their works.

The topics of these papers and communications fall into the following categories: history 82, literature 64, linguistics 13, fine arts 16 (including 10 art exhibits and 6 other exhibits), music 11, economics 5, demography 4, bibliography 4; the remainder are distributed among a variety of other topics.

Many of our members have been active on the international scholarly scene in Europe as well as in the United States. Institute members participate regularly and actively in the programs of other professional Slavist organizations in the United States, Canada, Australia, and Europe. My conservative estimate is that about 200 papers have been presented by our members at various international meetings, conferences, and symposia during the past two-and-a-half decades. During the years 1950-1960 many of our members were very active in the research programs of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. in Munich.

While many of those contributions were outstanding, it is axiomatic that however good a particular paper or communication is, it reaches only a limited number of people and the effort is seldom fully rewarded. If it is not made available to a broader audience in print, it can be lost altogether. However, because of financial problems, the task of publication is considerably more difficult than the task of organizing scholarly meetings.

Nevertheless, in the second year of its existence, in 1952, the Institute began to publish its scholarly journal, *Zapisy*. (The most appropriate translation of this title is probably "Transactions".) From 1952 to 1954 the first six volumes of *Zapisy* were published in New York. Volumes 7 through 11 were printed in the years 1962-1970 in Munich, Germany, under the editorship of Dr. Stanislaŭ Stankievič. Beginning with volume 12, in 1974, *Zapisy* began again to be published in New York. Volume 14 will appear shortly. Circulation has continued to grow with the appearance of each new member.

The contents of *Zapisy* include original scholarly papers, short communications, memoirs, documents, bibliography, book reviews, and a chronicle of Byelorussian scholarly, literary, and artistic activities. Volume 5 of *Zapisy*, published in Munich, is a

special issue devoted entirely to the anniversary of Byelorussian printing and to its founder, Doctor Francišak Skaryna. The volume is subtitled "Scoriniana, 1517-1967."

The total number of printed pages in **Zapisy** is 2,144. Over 30 authors have contributed to the journal. **Zapisy** now provides summaries in English and, beginning with the forthcoming issue, it will begin to include some entire articles in English. From volume 12 on **Zapisy** has received generous financial support from the Krečeuski Foundation in New York and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Foundation and its President, Mr. Nicholas Haroshka, for making this work possible.

From 1954 to 1963 the Byelorussian Institute published another serial, **Konadni** (Vigils). This was a literary magazine, which presented new work by Byelorussian poets, prose-writers, and literary critics, as well as articles dealing with Byelorussian art. After seven issues, totalling 688 pages, and including over 30 contributors, the magazine ceased publication due to financial difficulties.

A third publication, a house organ for members only, entitled **Abiežnik** (A Bulletin), appeared between 1953 and 1969. Seventeen issues were published.

Together with the regular publications of these various serials, the Byelorussian Institute has a program — not as large as we would like — of monographic publications. Among the most important titles published to date by the Institute are the following.

A volume of the selected poetry of Janka Kupała, **Spadčyna** (The Heritage), 1955, 564 pp. Part of the importance of this publication lies in the fact that it contains many of Kupała's works which are forbidden in the Soviet Union.

A book of poetry by Aleś Harun (1887-1920), **Matčyn Dar i inšyja tvory** (My Mother's Gift), 1962, 270 pp., edited by Professor Anton Adamovič. The works of Aleś Harun are still forbidden in the Byelorussian S.S.R.

An anthology of the writings of Maksim Bahdanovič (1891-1917), **Vianok paetyčnaj spadčyny**, (A Garland of Poetic Heritage), 1960, 270 pp., edited by Professor Anton Adamovič and Dr. Stanislau Stankievič.

The Institute has also published a monograph by Dr. Stanislau Stankievič, **Biełaruskaja padsavieckaja litaratura pieršaj pałaviny 60-ch hadoŭ** (Byelorussian Soviet Literature of the First Half of the Sixties), 1967, 170 pp.;

A monograph by Symon Braha, **Mickievič i biełaruskaja plyń polskaje litaratury** (Mickiewicz and the Byelorussian Trend in Polish Literature), 1957, 32 pp.;

A historical study by Paŭla Urban, **U šviate histaryčnaje praŭdy** (In the Light of Historical Truth), 1972, 132 pp.;

A volume by Adam Varłyha, **Prykazki Łahojščyny** (Proverbs from the Lahojsk Region), 1966, 124 pp.;

A monograph by Andrej Bahrovič, **Žycharstva Bielarskaje SSSR u šviate pierapisu 1959 hodu** (The Population of the Byelorussian SSR in Light of the 1959 Census), 1962, 88 pp.

Several monographic studies written by Symon Braha and devoted to the history of Byelorussian printing and its founder, Doctor Francis Skaryna have been published by the Institute; these include:

Doktar Skaryna ũ Maskvie (Doctor Skaryna in Moscow), 1963, 32 pp.

Lakalizacyja žyćciapisu Doktara Skaryny (The Localization of the Biography of Doctor Skaryna), 1965, 32 pp.

Pytańnie imia Doktara Skaryny ũ šviate aktaŭ i litaratury (The Question of Doctor Skaryna's Name in the Light of Acta and Literature), 1967, 40 pp.

In the field of music, the Byelorussian Institute has published an historical outline of Byelorussian music by the late composer, Mikola Kulikovič (1954, 64 pp.) and a collection of twelve songs by composer, Elza Zubkovič, **Kraj moj vasilkovy** (Golden Land of Mine) 1972, 32 pp.

Currently in press is a major volume of the collected poems of Natalla Arsieńnieva, **Miž Bierahami** (Between the Shores, poems of 1920-1970). The greatest problem which the Institute faces in implementing its publication program is budget. Printing costs are soaring and the income of the Institute depends solely on membership dues, donations, and the sale of publications.

Another major area of the Institute's activities over the years has been the organization of exhibits. The BIAS has sponsored ten exhibits of Byelorussian fine arts with the participation of over twenty artists from the United States, Canada, Australia, and Europe. Six other exhibits have been organized around such historical topics as Doctor Francis Skaryna, Byelorussian printing, Kastuś Kalinoŭski, and Ivan and Anton Łuckievič.

The Institute has also acted as consultant and lender of various items of Byelorussica to both Byelorussian and non-Byelorussian organizations and institutions for their exhibits. An especially good working relationship has been established with the New York Public Library; the Institute helped to organize such major exhibits as "Landmarks of Byelorussian Literature" in 1956, "450 Years of Byelorussian Printing" in 1968 on the anniversary of Skaryna's printing press, and several others. Dr. Vitaŭt Kipel has played an important role in virtually all of these exhibits.

The Institute has notable achievements in several fields of Byelorussian bibliography. Its reference and bibliographical files on Doctor Francis Skaryna and Scoriniana is the richest in the world, presently numbering c. 2,400 annotated cards. The "Bibliography of Scoriniana," published in 1970, contains close to 1,200 entries. The Institute also has a large collection of microfilms of Skaryna's original printings. Its bibliographical activity also embraces that politically most important epoch in Byelorussian history, the years 1917-1920, the period when first, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic and later, the Byelorussian Soviet Republic were established. The Institute collects documents, memoirs, and memorabilia pertaining to those years. Many documents and memoirs of this period have already been published in *Zapisy*, some of them in English translation. Dr. Jan Zaprudnik is working on a volume of documents covering the years 1917-1918; it is scheduled for publication in the near future.

A bibliographical file on "Byelorussia in Western Languages," initiated by Dr. Vitaŭt Kipel in 1959, presently contains over 4,000 entries. "A Guide to Byelorussia in the English Language" is being prepared for publication on the basis of this file. Dr. Kipel has also compiled a bibliography of Byelorussian dictionaries, consisting of over 500 entries. Dr. Raisa Źuk-Hryškievič is working on a bibliography of Byelorussian art and artists abroad. Composer Dzimitry Vierasaŭ is compiling a register of Byelorussian music and musicians in the Western world.

Over the years the Byelorussian Institute has given much information about Byelorussia and related questions to individual scholars, academic institutions, and governmental agencies, both by mail and through direct, personal contacts.

If one examines the achievements of the Institute and its members for the past 25 years in light of the immense needs and numerous tasks which exists, one might consider those achievements to be very modest. On the other hand, if one keeps in mind the relatively small number of workers in various specialized fields and the extremely limited — often non-existent — material resources available, one would have to admit that what has been accomplished during these two-and-a-half decades is significant and, in some areas, remarkable.

For example, in studying the history of Byelorussian printing and the activities of Doctor Skaryna, the Institute may claim to be ahead of the Academy of Sciences of the Byelorussian SSR. The Institute's work in this field has encouraged greater attention to be paid to Skaryna in Soviet Byelorussia. The same can be said about studies in the field of the political history of Byelorussia during the period of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic as well as in the area of the history of Byelorussian literature.

However, the importance of the Byelorussian Institute's activities derives not so much from the volume of its publications

as from the fact that the Institute's members enjoy complete freedom to deal with any problem, including those which are banned from scholarly investigation in Soviet Byelorussia, or whose treatment is proscribed by Party ukaz to a limited framework. Numerous problems in Byelorussian archeology, the ethnogenesis of the Byelorussians, the origins of the Byelorussian language, the early history of Byelorussia, or the later period of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania can be studied in Soviet Byelorussia today only within historiographic schemes and dogmas imposed by the Party censorship.

The history of Byelorussia records many outstanding figures such as St. Euphrosyne of Polatsk, Leŭ Sapieha, Ryhor Chadkievič, figures who are quite often not even mentioned by Soviet historians. In the field of literature, Francišak Alachnovič, the greatest playwright of the *Naša Niva* period, does not exist in Soviet works on the history of Byelorussian drama and letters, although his literary heritage consists of more than twenty plays. A similar situation obtains with the eminent poet, Ales Harun; the writer, Vlast (Vaclaŭ Lastoŭski); the literary critic Anton Navina; and many others.

On the other hand, there are a number of works by writers who are mentioned in Soviet books which are not published because of the vagaries of censorship. Although a monument has been erected in Minsk in honor of the greatest poet in Byelorussian literature, Janka Kupala, a significant part of his works, poems and plays, have been kept away from the people by the official censorship. The Academy of Sciences of the Byelorussian SSR is not permitted to publish them in Kupala's collections of works.

In these peculiar historical conditions free scholarly studies abroad assume extreme significance and weight. Increasing attention is being given to Byelorussian studies by American, English, and other Western scholars. Today in the West histories of Byelorussian literature, anthologies, grammars, and textbooks of the Byelorussian language are being published, together with linguistic and historical treatises. In this trend we see a guarantee that Byelorussian studies will continue to grow and develop. Such works as are being produced provide a firm basis for the conviction that the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences can expect in coming years to record even greater achievements than those of the first twenty-five years.

THE BYELORUSSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN CANADA: THE INSTITUTE'S PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Ivonka Survilla

President

The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in Canada

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to add only a few words to explain the special reasons why the members of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in Canada are celebrating the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in the United States.

As Dr. Tumash has said, when the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences was founded twenty-five years ago, it was intended to bring together our intellectual resources from all over the world, including Canada. Thus, practically all of us were members of your Institute.

It was only fifteen years later, in 1967, that the need for an independent Byelorussian scientific and cultural organization developed in Canada, and this need was met, not by the creation of a new body, but by the separation, for purely practical reasons, of the Canadian chapter of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences. Our Institute can therefore be considered an offshoot of the same ideological root, an offshoot which, because it encountered friendly ground and favorable conditions, began to grow and to develop into a separate tree and to bear fruit while remaining attached to the same root: our common goals and aspirations.

Since its foundation in 1967, the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in Canada has devoted all its efforts to familiarizing Canadians with Byelorussian culture, our aims and our problems.

Thus, for example, at symposiums organized by the Canadian Association of Slavists, members of the Institute presented papers on subjects related to Byelorussian immigration to Canada.

To celebrate the 450th Anniversary of Printing in Byelorussia, an exhibition of prints and books dedicated to Francišak Skaryna was organized in Toronto.

In 1971, the first Byelorussian conference attended by both Byelorussian and non-Byelorussian scholars took place at Queen's University in Kingston, Canada.

At the tenth Convention of Byelorussians in North America, which was held in Toronto in 1972, the Institute organized an exhibition of Byelorussian painting.

In 1975, at the University of Ottawa, the Institute, in co-operation with the Department of Slavic Studies of that University, organized its second conference or study week, on the subject of "The Byelorussian Presence in North America". The program of the study week included an evening of poetry reading dedicated to our great poetess, Natalla Arsieńnieva, and an exhibition of Byelorussian folk art, organized in co-operation with the Canadian National Museum of Man.

At present we are preparing another exhibition of Byelorussian folk art, this time in co-operation with the Ottawa Public Library. The exhibition starts on March 1, and will last until the end of the month.

One of our immediate objectives is the publication of the papers of the University of Ottawa Conference and the Kingston Conference. The problems related to such an undertaking are known to all of us. In this particular case, however, they are complicated by the fact that some of the participants have not yet sent in their presentations, and I would like to take this opportunity to ask for your co-operation in this respect.

During our ten years of existence, we have achieved results which have often exceeded our resources. These achievements have been made possible to a large extent thanks to the co-operation which has been extended to us, in the form of active participation at conferences and even gathering of material for our folk-art exhibition, by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in the United States.

To the President and to all the members of this Institute, I would like to express today our gratitude and sincere thanks, and wish them every success in their future undertakings.

Thank you.

KUPALA'S PROHIBITED WORKS

Stanislaŭ Stankievič

Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences

Among the variety of ways that Moscow has employed to subjugate the Byelorussian people have been (a) censoring literary works which express national aspirations and (b) propagating a biased interpretation of those writings which are allowed to appear. Both methods have been widely practiced particularly in regard to the heritage of the most outstanding Byelorussian poet, Janka Kupala (1882-1942).

During the post-World War II period there have been three editions of Kupala's works: the first 6-volume collection was published in 1952-1954 when Stalinist dogmatism was still in full force. From this edition at least 160 works, written both before and after the Revolution, were excluded. Thus nearly a quarter of the poet's heritage was banned. This amount, however, was reduced to slightly over 50 works when Kupala's 6-volume set was republished in 1961-1963 during the height of the de-Stalinization campaign.

When the ensuing edition was in preparation, it was repeatedly mentioned in the press that it would be the most complete of Kupala's collections. There were, however, reasons to believe that some of Kupala's post-Revolutionary poems would be omitted from this edition because of their national ideas and anti-Soviet tilt. But one hoped that as far as pre-Revolutionary poetry was concerned it would be published in its entirety. Such expectations were generated and reinforced by the fact that in the accompanying discussions the most outspoken of Kupala's pre-Revolutionary poems, which had not been included in the first two editions, were not only mentioned but given a positive appraisal.¹

In spite of this, however, the third post-WW II edition in 7 volumes, published in 1972-1976, excluded about a dozen pre-Revolutionary and nearly two dozen post-Revolutionary poems. Prohibited were: 1) poems depicting in somber colors the national, social, and political subjugation of Byelorussians in tsarist Russia; 2) poems in which Kupala castigated and denounced tsarist Russia and landlord Poland as oppressors of Byelorussia; and 3) poems about Byelorussia's glorious historical past.²

A typical example of the first category of poems is Kupała's popular pre-Revolutionary poem, "Zabrany kraj," first published in his book of poetry, *Ślacham żywćia*, in 1913.

To circumvent tsarist censorship Kupała supplied the poem with a dedication — "To the Balkan Slavs." The Balkan Slavs were then under Turkish rule. In reality, however, the poem was about the poet's native land of Byelorussia. It was, therefore, logical for Kupała to remove the dedication when he included this poem in his books published during the 1920s. Here is how Kupała depicts the oppressive atmosphere in Byelorussia within the Russian Empire:

Мальбішчам чужым б'е пакора паклоны;
Упадку вялічыцца сыцяг;
З балотам змяшаны старыя законы,
Наладжан нявольнічы шлях.
Купляюць, збываюць, гандлююць чужынцы
Народным дабром як сваім . . .
Заплача ў пагоду канюх па расінцы, —
„Забраны край” жаліцца зь ім.

Наведзены струны у скрыпках пасвойску
Чужая зрывае рука;
Жалейка азьвецца зь вясны пад бярозкай, —
Ня ўцешыць яна бедака.
Так камень ня ляжа, як змора падданья
Лягла ад мяжы да мяжы
З надзеяй, што нават і думку змаганья
„Забраны край” вырве з душы.

In the poems of the second group, in one way or another, the poet expresses his protest against the subjugation of Byelorussia by tsarist Russia or royal Poland, e.g., in the poem, "Paprostu":

Проста жывём мы, як доля лучыць,
І крывадушыць не прабавалі . . .
Просім папросту: кіньце нас мучыць,
Ляхі, маскалі!

It is generally known that Kupała never spoke against either the Russian or the Polish peoples. Under the words, "**Lachi, maskali**", he undoubtedly understood those nationalist Polish and Russian circles who conducted a chauvinistic policy toward Byelorussians and refused to recognize them as a separate people. In a series of poems, passed by the tsarist censors but prohibited by the Soviets, Kupała does not refer to those oppressors by name —

he speaks of them descriptively as "aliens," "foreigners," "vengeful forces from the East and West," or "the wicked neighbor."

The conclusion is obvious: the tsarist censorship which allowed those poems to be published was more tolerant toward Kupala and the aspirations of the Byelorussians than the Soviet censorship which prohibits them. The only reason for this prohibition could be that the accusations contained in those poems can be easily re-addressed to present-day oppressors.

Of the pre-Revolutionary poems in the third group, on Byelorussia's historical past, the following still remain prohibited: "Nad Niomanam," "Z minuŭšych dzion," "Bratu Bielarusu," and the long poem, "Na Kućciu."

"Nad Niomanam" contains one of the basic ideas for the entire Naša Niva-period and thus has a programmatic character. Kupala evokes in his people's memory the vision of the remote past from the times of the Polatsk Principality and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a glorious and happy epoch of political independence, military prowess, and cultural flourishing of the Byelorussian people and juxtaposes it with the gloomy reality within the Russian Empire. The poet brings out the memory of a happier past when:

Буйным жыццём усё чыста кіпела,
Слава далёка за мора ішла.
Ворага кожны за плечы браў сьмела,
Цемра чужынцаў ня страшнай была.

Панам быў дома і слаўны за домам
Мой патаптаны сягоння народ;
Змог ён ня толькі знаць штукі з заломам, —
Роднаму слову ўмеў кніжны даць ход.

З вольнай дружнаю князь на пасадзе
Вольнаму люду законы пісаў;
Слухалі князя, а князь што ня ўладзіў —
Слухаў, што вечна яму звон казаў . . .

Так, так, мой дружа, іначай бывала, —
Не называўся забытым мой край;
„Поўнач” ня раз у ім схову шукала,
„Захад” знаў сілу яго неўнарай.

The poet contrasts this picture of the past with the oppressive reality of the present. Through the personified Nioman River Kupala says:

Так грамадзяне свабоднага краю
Ёрмы узьдзелі, у рабства пайшлі,
Прадзедаў слава лазой зарастае,
Памяць мінуўшчыны дрэмле ў зямлі.

Рынкам жывога тавару няслава
Край ўвесь зрабіла, загнала на ўбой,
Дзе ўжо лет сотні Масква і Варшава
Торг гругановы вядуць між сабой.

The images of the glorious past which run counter to Party dogma about Byelorussia's history explain why this and other historical poems of Kupala have been censored. According to the official historiography, before the October Revolution Byelorussia never had political independence, but was always dominated by the so-called Old-Russian State of Kievan Rus' or by the Lithuanian feudal lords. Only the October Revolution, says official dogma, gave Byelorussia her national statehood for the first time in history, as a result of Leninist (or Stalinist) nationality policy and with the selfless help of the "great" Russian people.

Such impartial Soviet historians, however, as Leanid Alek-siejeŭ, Mikola Praškovič, Viačasłaŭ Čamiarycki, Mikola Alaks-iutovič, and others have shown that the Byelorussians possessed sovereign statehood in earlier historical times. Mikola Alaksiu-tovič, a young and talented historian (who died in 1967), even stated that the claim of earlier sovereignty does not contradict official historiography because the latter does not speak of state-hood in general, but of "socialist" statehood.³

The poem "Nad Niomanam," along with some other prohibited works by Kupala, had been given a positive interpretation by Soviet Byelorussian critics, for example, in the second volume of the academic *Bielaruskaja dakastryčnickaja litaratura* (1969); in the fundamental monograph by Michaś Jaroš, *Janka Kupala i bielaruskaja paezija* (1971); and in Roza Hulman's book, *Tekstaŭhija tvo-raŭ Janki Kupały* (1971). All this, however, did not rescue these poems from the censors when the third edition of his *Zbor tvoraŭ* was published in 1972-76. Still, the overall number grew.

This 7-volume set included 13 poems which had not found their way into the two previous collections. Ten of these were written in 1918-1922 when Kupala as well as Jakub Kołas and Zmitroŭ Biadula stood firmly in defense of the Byelorussian national revolution.

Among the ten poems allowed to appear was a programmatic verse, "Svajmu narodu" which Kupala wrote while in Smalensk almost a year after the October Revolution, on October 29, 1918. This poem, along with another one, composed on the same day, "Na schod!" — which too, was allowed to see the light of the day although in distorted form; (we shall discuss it later) — are the first two of Kupala's verses in which the poet, in disregard of, or rather, in counteraction to the ideas of the October Revolution, called upon his people to rise on behalf of a national revolution. His ardent poem-appeal concludes with the following expressive lines:

Паўстань, народ! Прачніся, Беларусе!
Зірні на Бацькаўшчыну, на сябе!
Зірні, як вораг жату і зямлю раструсіў,
Як твой навала злыдняў скарб грабе!

Паўстань і глянь, як зьзяюць скрозь вагнішчы,
Як носяцца ўсясьветных зьмен віхры,
Як на старога быту папалішчы
Цвет зацвітае новае зары!

Паўстань, народ! Для будучыні шчасьце
Ты строй, каб пут ня строіў больш сусед;
Ня дайся ў гэты грозны час прапасьці, —
Прапашчых не пацешыць шчасьцем сьвет.

Сваю магутнасьць пакажы ты сьвсту, —
Свой край, сябе ў пашане мець прымусь.
Паўстань народ!... З крыві і сьлёз кліч гэты...
Цябе чакае Маці-Беларусь!

In this poem there is not even a hint of the class struggle that was the main slogan of the October Revolution. The poet calls his people to fight not against capitalists and landlords, who are not even implied in the poem, but for national liberation to prevent "the neighbor from fettering us any more."

In addition, the poem "Svajmu narodu" glorifies Byelorussia's national past and in this respect it sounds as strong as the poem, "Nad Niomanam," which is still prohibited. Here are the most telling lines from "Svajmu narodu":

Ты жыў, ты панаваў у краі родным,
Сьцярог ад чужака й законы укладаў;
Звон вечавы сход склікаваў народны,
І сход аб шчасьці Бацькаўшчыны дбаў.

In spite of inclusion in the third post-war edition of thirteen poems that the previous edition did not contain, it is still impossible fully to establish Kupala's ideological outlook in the immediate post-revolutionary years without the poems that were not admitted into the latest 7-volume set. Among the excluded are five programmatic poems of the 1918-1922 period: "Kryŭda," "Paŭstań z narodu našaha," "Žydy," "Pierad budućyniaj," "Pazvali vas," six poems in the series of "Na vajskovyja matyvy" (composed in 1919-1920 in the manner of folk songs for the needs of the military units of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic which were then being organized), and a satirical play in four acts, "Tutejšyja," written in 1922.

Let us briefly mention here the poem "Žydy," written in 1919. It fell into the category of prohibited works not only because of its title — (the word *žyd* is considered by the Soviets to be pejorative, which is true for the Russian language, but not for Byelorussian, Polish, and Ukrainian for which this term is neutral and normal) — but even more so for its ideological-political meaning: Kupala draws a parallel between the destiny and goals of the Byelorussian and the Jewish peoples, as the following stanzas clearly indicate:

Раськіданыя гібнуць па ўсім сьвеце
Вы Мэсыі чакаеце яшчэ, Жыды, —
Тэй Мэсыі ждуць і Беларусі дзеці
І ■ вамі пойдучь, як вы з намі, ўсе тады.

Ваш ясны сьветач там, дзе Палестына,
Наш ясны сьветач — Маці-Беларусь адна;
Спадзе ланцуг ваш у сьляпым загіну,
Спадзе ланцуг наш і зазьзяе ўсім вясна!

Also excluded from this third edition are three poems published in the magazine *Polymia* (no. 6, 1926, Minsk): "Jość-ža jašče . . .," "Kab," and "Akoŭ pałomanych žandar." The year 1926, when they were published, marked the apogee of the national revival in Soviet Byelorussia as a result of the policies of *bielaruszizacyja* adopted by the All-Byelorussian Party conference in March of 1923. Among the dozen-and-a-half poems Kupala wrote in 1926 there is not a single one which specifically praises Soviet reality even in its national-Communist variety. Kupala, after some years of vacillation, again assumed the role of his people's spokesman and leader fighting for the national cause. The most typical of these 1926 poems is the following one which was also omitted from the volume of Kupala's selected poetry published in Munich in 1955 by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Science:

Ёсьць-жа яшчэ ў мяне сіла
Крыўдзе ня дацца, змагацца,
Над сыпячых продкаў магілай
Вольна маланкай мігацца.

Ёсьць-жа яшчэ ў мяне сэрца,
Поўнае шчырых жаданьняў,
Якое перш разарвецца,
Чымся любіць перастане.

Ёсьць-жа ў мяне яшчэ песень,
Поўных надзеі, жыцьця, —
Як-бы ня быў ім сьвет цесен,
Вырвуцца ў сьвет зь нябыцьця.

Ёсьць-жа яшчэ ў мяне вера
Ў вольны мой родны народ,
Што — у патрэбе — зь сякэрай
Выйдзе за волю ў паход!

Ёсьць-жа яшчэ . . . Ну, а людзі?
Сябры-суседзі тут, там?
Вы — непадкупныя судзьдзі,
Што-ж яшчэ хочацца вам?!

Finally, it would be worthwhile to illustrate how some of Kupala's poems are falsified. We shall take as an example his poem "Na schod!," written in Smalensk on October 29, 1918. It was included in mutilated form in the second post-WW II edition and was repeated in the third edition. In it Kupala calls upon the Byelorussian people to go "to the Rally, all-national, stern and thunderous Rally" — an allegory of national revolution — in order to report and relate,

Як гналі пот зь цябе паны і каралі,
Як гналі проч цары з радзімае зямлі,
І як крываўляць раскаваныя рабы,
Як ты ўпадаеш зь непасільнай барацьбы.

The latter two lines were dropped from both the second and the third editions, although they are mentioned in the commentaries at the end of the book. The omission, however, was not indicated in the body of the poem. We should note that the poet placed along with "pany i karali" and "cary" the "raskavanyja raby" — the Bolsheviks — who, too, drove the enslaved Byelorussian people "away from their native land." The censors, in order to avoid the undesired implication, changed the latter two lines from the present tense to the past tense:

Як раскаваныя крывавілі рабы,
Як падаў ты ад непасільнай барацьбы.

The censorship clearly attempted to obfuscate the reference to the Bolsheviks who also "bled" the Byelorussian people as Kupala obviously meant by using the present tense when publishing this poem throughout the 1920's.

Ivan Navumienka, the Soviet Byelorussian writer and literary critic (recently appointed director of the Kupala Institute of Literature), went even further. In his book, *Janka Kupala — Duchoŭny voblik hieroja* (1967), Navumienka, having quoted the above poem without the two lines, found it possible to maintain that the poem "Na schod!," along with other poems of the period

constitutes a "re-evaluation of ideological and spiritual values" by Kupala and his shift toward acceptance of the ideas of the October Revolution.⁴

Kupala repeated his reference to the Bolsheviks as "unfettered slaves" whose "human spirit did not soar upward" and who "lent their shoulders to the Wrong," in another of his 1918 poems, "Kryūda" (The Wrong).

There is also another kind of censorship of Kupala's works.

While the general trend has been to increase the number of accessible poems, the verses extolling Stalin, included in the first post-WW II edition, disappeared from the second and the third editions. Dithyrambs to Stalin did not coincide or simply contradicted the Party's de-Stalinization campaign. At the time when Kupala's second post-WW II edition was being published, Piatruś Broŭka, chairman of the Byelorussian Writers' Union, speaking at the Union's plenum on January 31, 1962 said:

"The Stalin personality cult slowed down, fettered, and limited the artists' thoughts and, of course, impoverished their works of art. The great losses suffered by Soviet literature and the arts are generally known. Our Byelorussian literature lost a great deal, too. At a time when Soviet Byelorussian belles-lettres were flourishing, during a period of their unusual growth, the cult of personality, with severity and harshness broke off and mutilated the branches of this blossoming tree, and numerous active workers of literature — writers and artists — had to suffer in ghastly conditions for many years and many of them lost their lives . . . We all have contributed to that in a way. Even such wise and staunch men as our teachers, Janka Kupala and Jakub Kołas, paid respect in many of their works to the cult of personality. Jakub Kołas, luckily, while he was still alive was able to cleanse many of his best works of this slime, but Kupala was not able to perform such a task. This unneeded appendage hangs on a considerable part of his works done in the Soviet period. And now we have to think of what should be done. I feel that at the end of those works where the words, "great Stalin," were simply attached to assure their publication, those words must be removed, because the works themselves are good and highly artistic and they have nothing to do with the cult of personality with the exception of that specific addendum. Janka Kupala's attitude toward the cult is well known to all of us and we are quite convinced that were he alive today he would have gladly done this himself."⁵

Comparison of the first and third post-WW II editions shows that 21 poems from the years 1934-1942 were dropped entirely from the third and 25 poems were published with larger or smaller deletions, sometimes just one word — Stalin.

While agreeing with Broŭka that Kupala's praising of Stalin was not sincere but had been forced out of him, it is important

to emphasize that some of Kupala's poems in Stalin's honor sound like clear and not particularly veiled irony directed at Stalin and as such should be regarded as anti-Stalinist. This can be said without the slightest doubt about the poem "Tabie, pravadyr" written on November 20, 1936, in the sixth year after Kupala's unsuccessful attempt at suicide and at the beginning of the bloody Yezhov wave of terrorism. It is impossible to regard other than ironical, for example, the following unnatural superlatives addressed to Stalin which is the content of the entire long poem:

Табе, правадыр, мае песьні і думы,
І шчырыя шчырага сэрца парывы!
Бо хто калі сьніў, ды хто калі думаў,
Што буду я вольны, што буду шчасьлівы.

Бо хто калі думаў, што я жыці буду,
Як птушка, як вецер над нівай квяцістай,
І дзівам дзівіцца вялікаму цуду,
Што вокал мяне так цуднее ўрачыста.

Што ты, правадыр, нібы яснае сонца,
Мне вочы адкрыеш на землі і неба . . .
Сьвяціся-ж ты, сонца, ў маё век аконца!
Вітаю цябе я і сольлю, і хлебам.

A similar panegyric sound with implied sarcasm is discernible in the poems "Majo mnje sonca pravadyr" (1935), "Ab Stalinie-siejbitu piesnia maja" (1937), "Dziakuju partyji Lenina-Stalina" (1941), and some others.

Broŭka's convincing statement that "the unneeded appendage" in Kupala's poems was but a device "to assure their publication" leads us, logically, to the basic conclusion that Kupala's paeans to the Communist party and the Soviet system in Byelorussia was in a similar way insincere and forced upon him by political circumstances. These laudations could also be classified as "unneeded appendages" "to assure publication" of what was dear to the poet's heart.

NOTES

¹ *Historyja biełaruskaj dakastryčnickaj literatury*, v. 2, Minsk, 1969; Michaś Jaroš, *Janka Kupala i biełaruskaja paezija*, Minsk, 1971; Ivan Navumienka, *Janka Kupala — Duchouny voblik hieroja*, Minsk, 1967; Roza Hulman, *Tekstałohija tvorau Janki Kupaly*, Minsk, 1971.

² For a detailed analysis of Kupala's prohibited works which did not appear in the first post-World War II edition, see, Stanisław Stankevich, "Kupala praudzivy i Kupala schvalšavany," in: *Biełaruski Zbornik* (Insti-

tute for the Study of the USSR, Munich), 1956, book 4, and by the same author, "Kupała in Fact and Fiction," **Belorussian Review** (Institute for the Study of the USSR, Munich), 1956, no. 3 (an abbreviated version of the Byelorussian original).

³ Mikoła Aleksjutovič, "A dzie-ž iscina abjektyunaja?" **Polymia** (Minsk), 1966, no. 5, p. 183.

⁴ I. Navumienka, **Janka Kupała — Duchouny voblik hieroja**, Minsk, 1967, pp. 109, 113-121.

⁵ **Litaratura i Mastactva** (Minsk), Feb. 2, 1962.

THREE HISTORICAL POEMS OF JANKA KUPALA

Olga P. Orechwa
Southern Illinois University

The historical poems of Janka Kupala do not merely recount history in verse, but incorporate historical themes preserved in Byelorussian folklore and oral tradition. In his poems Kupala drew on aspects of the past, romanticizing and emphasizing them, so that his readers, the Byelorussian people of his time, could better understand themselves and their lot. In this way the historical past does not exist as a separate entity in Kupala's poems, but is connected with the present and the future. Kupala achieves this artistic linkage through remarkable combinations of realistic, romantic, and folkloric elements employed most clearly in his three historical poems: **Kurhan** (1910), **Bandaroŭna** (1913), and **Mahila Lva** (1913).

All three poems are based on themes from folklore which provided Kupala with heroic figures capable of arousing in the Byelorussian people the idea of national freedom, which had been suppressed for centuries by either Poland or Russia. At the same time, the riches of folk art and tradition helped the poet to find different compositional structures within which he could express his themes, as for an example, Kupala used an ethnic epic in **Kurhan**, a folk ballad in **Mahila Lva**, and a lyric song in **Bandaroŭna**.

The dramatic narrative poem **Kurhan**, after it first appeared in 1910, was immediately recognized as a highly romantic work. And, Maksim Bahdanovich, the talented Byelorussian poet and critic, had pointed out that Kupala with his poem **Kurhan** had resurrected romanticism, which in the literature of other countries had already been buried for almost a hundred years. But, Bahdanovich continued, the Byelorussian literature that was suppressed in its development in the previous century, had not had a romantic period, and thus for it this was "a completely new thing." Moreover, Bahdanovich noted that the romantic form used for the poem **Kurhan** was especially suitable for its main themes.

The plot of **Kurhan** has no basis in historical events; the separate details of the plot, however, were borrowed from folk

legends, songs, and from foreign romantic literature. The main hero of the poem is a folk-bard. The bard is a well-known figure found throughout folk literature, and has become a part of artistic literature as, for example, the bard in **The Campaign of Igor**. In the poem **Kurhan** Kupala describes only one episode from the life of the bard, but it is precisely at the point the independent and freedom-loving character of the hero presents itself most vividly that the old and feeble folk-bard rises to his full nobility. The poem is built around the dramatic conflict of wills between a bard and a prince. This conflict is resolved by the victory of the bard. The victory, however, is moral, and in the end results in the death of the bard. The bard achieves victory through his song, in which he fearlessly challenges the prince, calling him to see the truth: to look at his subjects toiling away their lives in his fields while many are rotting in his dungeons. The bard dared to say in his song that the Prince has the power to torture and to behead, but he cannot fetter in chains the free thought of the bard. Thus, the song of the bard shows the Prince that his tyranny and his wealth are not eternal, that they cannot suppress ideas expressed in song — the notion of the sovereignty of free art.

Kupala does not strive to depict the development of the character of the bard. The whole movement of the plot is subordinate to the main goal of emphasizing and extolling the bard's song. For Kupala the song carries within itself as its basic theme the social imperative that art should be truthful, that it serve the people, and that only thanks to the independence of the artist from the corrupting effect of wealth and tyranny can art preserve its purity and carry out its historic and social mission.

The poem's overall romantic style is based not only on the fact that it borrows from folk tradition, but also on its structure as a whole. This structure reflects events and dramatic action, which are at times calm, almost somnolent, and at other times vigorous and strong. These sharp dramatic conflicts present a typical example of the romantic narrative poem.

However, when necessary, Kupala draws on realism with its tangible portrayal of life or uses as a link a 'living' word or phrase. Thus, in his poem **Kurhan** the action takes place in an imaginary setting, but Kupala strengthens the unity of the work by referring to the legend and at the same time introducing the words "people say", which tie the imaginary world of legends of the past to the reality of the present. Though the poem **Kurhan** deals with events in the distant past reflected in the folklore, its main theme encompasses problems which were of great importance to Kupala and to the Byelorussian people. For Kupala the problems of social and national subjugation were inseparably linked.

The poem **Bandaroŭna**, written in 1913 and based on a folk song well known in Byelorussian and Ukrainian folklore, is even more closely linked to the problems of social and national subjugation of the Byelorussian people in Kupala's time.

The original song, called **A Song About Bandaroŭna**, originated in the second half of the eighteenth-century in the western part of Ukraine, which at the same time was under Polish rule. It tells the story of the beautiful daughter of a Cossack ataman, Ivan Bandarenko, who would not yield to the will of a Polish landowner, and who accepted death rather than dishonor. There are many versions of **A Song About Bandaroŭna**, but if we compare these different versions with Kupala's poem, we see that he used only those in which the subject of social injustice and inequality is most prominent. In other words, Kupala especially emphasized those points which connect the grief of **Bandaroŭna** with the plight of the Byelorussian people, i.e., with the problems of social and national subjugation to foreign rule. In the poem **Bandaroŭna**, the heroine is a symbol of the Cossack's heroism and strength, which leads them to an uprising against a wealthy magnate.

Kupala's poem follows **A Song About Bandaroŭna**, not only in its theme, but also in its poetic style and structure. The portrait of the heroine is romanticized in traditional folk-song style with much use of nature comparisons, fixed epithets, and other devices such as hyperbole and parallel constructions. For example, when Kupala describes the heroine's striking beauty: her lips are compared with raspberries, her face with lilies, and her eyes with the stars. The symbol of a dove for the heroine and of a hawk for the tyrant-landowner have clear meaning and value in revealing the inner quality of their characters. On the other hand, in order to reveal more deeply the heroine's nobility of character Kupala uses such means as internal monologue, lyrical digressions, and simple description. When the landlord's servants bring **Bandaroŭna** to their master, Kupala describes her torn garments, her disheveled braids, and her speech—all testifying to her refusal to succumb to the will of the magnate. Thus the riches of folklore gave Kupala a framework within which he could unite the character of the heroine with life and nature around her, and at the same time correlate her beautiful appearance with her inner thoughts and feelings.

In the last part of the poem, Kupala transfers the heroine's feelings for freedom and human dignity to the people as they rise in revolt against the social and national oppression under which they have been living.

The poem **Mahila Lva** was also written in 1913. The plot of this poem recalls a folk legend and its hero, **Masheka**, is an idealized hero from a folk epic. **Masheka** is endowed with immense strength and a sense of justice, but in the course of the poem

Masheka loses his sense of justice, and, blindly seeking cruel revenge, becomes an enemy of all society and turns into a highwayman. Kupala strives to explain the violent actions of the hero, seeking its reason in the social inequality between the peasant Masheka and his antagonist, a landlord. Kupala does not close his poem, as is the case in the folk legend, with the simple statement that the hero turns to a life as a highwayman because of the loss of his beloved to a landlord; rather, Kupala gives the deeper social cause—the fact that Masheka's loved one was drawn away from him not by the landlord as a man, but by his social position and his wealth. Kupala does not alter the central action of the original folk legend, but within that legend he indirectly and persistently searches for the answer to "our abuse and our misfortune". Kupala identifies the plight of the hero Masheka with this question by making it clear that his abuse at the hands of the Polish landlord is related to the abuse of the Byelorussian people.

Kupala's Masheka, who like the hero of the folk-legend, initially seeks only revenge against those who he feels have wronged him, in the end becomes a highwayman, who, in the process of robbing and killing, no longer differentiates between nobles and common people. Killing is Masheka's form of revolt but, even though possessing superhuman strength, he is not victorious.

Kupala shows his reader that Masheka's lone revolt is of no avail and in the end is without purpose. Furthermore, Kupala leads the reader to conclude that, to succeed in breaking the yoke of oppression, it is necessary to see the real causes of the misfortune and to have all who are oppressed act in united fashion against their oppressors.

Each of these three historical-narrative poems: **Kurhan**, **Bandaroŭna**, and **Mahila Lva** are significant achievements in the work of Kupala. The poems show, in their themes and through their narrative structure, that Kupala valued the cultural resources of folklore, and that he knew that these resources had greater national value and were more lasting than any material edifices, which could be erased by time. Thus, when Kupala writes in praise of the heroic past in his historical poems, he tries to illuminate the present for the poor and oppressed Byelorussian people, and to show them the way to a better future. To this end, the riches of folklore gave Kupala artistic inspiration and enriched his poetry with vivid heroic figures that served to elevate the national spirit. At the same time, Kupala's attempt to comprehend the heroic-romantic aspect of the folk-legend was a very valuable achievement for the whole of Byelorussian literature, endowing it with a new romantic genre and widening its horizons for further development.

THE PROBLEM OF THE BEGINNINGS OF BYELORUSSIAN LITERATURE

Anthony Adamovich
The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences

The first problem facing the historian of Byelorussian literature is the question of where to date the beginning of its history.

Maksim Harecki, whose **History of Byelorussian Literature**, published in 1920, was the first attempt to produce a more or less comprehensive and systematic survey of the entire span of the history of Byelorussian literature, solved this problem simply and logically in his own way. Harecki took **the appearance of the written language** in Byelorussia in the 10th century as the starting point of Byelorussian literature. As is well known, that language was what is called Church Slavic and Harecki considered Church Slavic in the form in which it appeared in Byelorussia to be the first standard literary language, or, as he put it, the first national language of Byelorussian literature. Therefore, he named the first period in his **History of Byelorussian Literature** "the Church Slavic Period", including in it all the literary works which appeared or were in circulation in Byelorussia from the 10th to the 13th centuries.

Maksim Harecki formulated his position this way:

The written language came to Byelorussia together with the Christian faith in the tenth century. The first books — ecclesiastical works, translated from the Greek and handwritten in Cyrillic — appeared among us, imported by the southern Slavs. From the ecclesiastics who arrived from the South, the Byelorussian princes and ecclesiastics learned written language by reading these books. In due course they copied them for the dissemination of the faith and the salvation of souls . . . The language of the Byelorussian tribes at that time of its development was probably quite close to the language of the first Slavic books . . . Until the 13th century what might be called Old Byelorussian, interspersed with Church Slavisms, was the common standard language for all educated Byelorussians. This can be considered our

national language in the initial period of the formation of the single nation.¹

In his **History** Maksim Harecki relied upon some works by the well-known philologist who had delved deeply into the study of the Byelorussian language and literature, Professor (and Academician) Jaŭchim Karski; he relied especially upon Karski's articles in which the facts of Byelorussian literature of the 13th to the 18th centuries were described. But when the second part of volume 3 of Karski's well-known and fundamental work, **Byelorussians**, appeared in 1921 (i.e., a year after Harecki's **History**), the problem of the starting point of Byelorussian literature was treated quite differently there from how it had been in Harecki's book.

In the first paragraphs of **Byelorussians**, dedicated to Old Byelorussian literature ("West Russian", to use Karski's term), the author wrote:

With the adoption of Christianity a written language appeared among the Russian tribes. It is natural that those tribes which in due course formed the Byelorussian people were joined in this cultural manifestation of the spiritual life as well. But the first literature evoked by the needs of Christianity, which came to us thanks to the Southern Slavs, was in Old Church Slavic, with some local Russian peculiarities in the language and orthography. Works of this kind were at first disseminated in those places where Byelorussians are now living as well. The works of Cyril, Bishop of Turov in the 11th century, differed in no way from the works of other Russian writers of that time. Such works in Russian, even if they appeared on the territory occupied by contemporary Byelorussia, cannot be the object of our consideration.

We can only begin to speak of Old West Russian literature when this literature began clearly to betray peculiarities of the Byelorussian dialect, which began, properly speaking, only in the 14th century, and became full blown in the 15th-16th centuries.²

Until the 1930s all the authors who wrote in Byelorussian shared Harecki's position toward this problem, rather than Karski's. But in the course of Stalin's pogrom against Byelorussian culture in the 1930s Byelorussian literature before the 18th and 19th centuries was declared "alien and hostile", as being "religious" and "feudal", and was excluded from any course of studies. Byelorussian literature and its history was arbitrarily defined as beginning, if not with "the Great October Revolution" — as the most extreme enthusiasts of this official trend put it —

then, at least not earlier than with the 19th century. Only on the eve of the Second World War, in 1939, was the Soviet Byelorussian periodical, **Polymia Revalucyi** allowed to publish in installments "Outlines of the History of Byelorussian Literature during its Old Period", written by Professor Michael Dobrynin, a Russian. After the war, in 1952, Dobrynin's "Outlines..." were published separately in book form under the title **Byelorussian Literature: The Ancient Period**.³ Professor Dobrynin, in complete accord with Professor Karski, included in the category of "Ancient Byelorussian Literature" only the literary works of the 13th through the 18th centuries; before that time, according to Professor Dobrynin, only "the literature of Kievan Rus'" existed in common for the Russians, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians, and Dobrynin did not touch on this at length in his "Outlines...".

Three years after Stalin's death, in 1956, the Institute of Literature and Art of the Academy of Sciences of the BSSR published a volume of collective authorship, entitled **Outlines of the History of Byelorussian Literature**.⁴ The first section of this book was entitled "Ancient Literature and the Literature of the 18th Century" and opened with a chapter entitled "The Literature of Kievan Rus' ". In that way the literature of the 10th to the 12th centuries was included once again in the history of Byelorussian literature.

The section entitled "Old Literature and the Literature of the 18th Century" was written by Vitali Volski, and within two years, in 1958, it appeared separately in book form under the title **Outlines of the History of Byelorussian Literature in the Epoch of Feudalism**. In the introduction to this book its author confesses that in "The Literature of Kievan Rus'" his "attention was attracted in the first place to those works which came into being on the territory of Byelorussia, and were connected with it by their content, language, and the life of their authors, as well as to the separate elements of this literature which have some relationship to the history of the population of Byelorussia (for example, the episodes with the adventures of Usiaslaŭ of Polatsk in the **Igor Tale**)".⁵

Volski's approach has been canonized, so to speak, in the history of Byelorussian literature written in the BSSR.

So a two-volume work of collective authorship under the title **A History of Pre-October Byelorussian Literature** published by the Institute of Literature named after Janka Kupala of the Academy of Sciences of the BSSR in 1968, proclaimed by its authors in self-congratulatory fashion to be "the first scholarly history of national literature", called its first section "The Literature of Old Rus'" and here the author, Mikola Praskovič, pays attention in the same way that Volski did "to those works which came into being on the territory of Byelorussia, were connected

with it by their content, language, and the life of their authors". Praskovič carefully, if not always competently, notes the Byelorussianisms in the language of the works which he describes.

All of this reminds me of an amusing old story. A bath-house, a Byelorussian sauna, was supposed to be built in a small Byelorussian township. But from the very beginning the builders quarrelled among themselves about what to do with the floor: should they plane its planks or not? Some of them argued that one could easily get splinters in his feet if the planks of the floor were not planed. Others objected that one could easily slip on the smooth planed floor covered with soapsuds and could injure not only his feet, but even his head. The local sage to whom they turned for arbitration solved the problem in good dialectical fashion. "You should plane them," he said to the advocates of planing; and then, turning to their opponents, he advised, "but put them in with the planed side down".

It is in the spirit of just such "dialectics" that many problems are solved in "the kingdom of Dialectical Materialism", among them the problem of the beginnings of the history of Byelorussian literature.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Maksim Harecki, **Historyja Bielaruskaje Literatury**, Vilnia, 1920, p. 4.

² Ye. F. Karski, **Byelorusy**, tom III: Očerk slovesnosti belorusskogo plemeni, 2: Staraya zapadno-russkaya pismennost, Petrograd, 1921, p. 3.

³ Profesar M. K. Dabrynin, **Bielaruskaya Litaratura: Starožytny Peryjad**, Minsk, 1952.

⁴ Instytut Litaratury i Mastactva Akademii Navuk BSSR. **Narysy pa historyi bielaruskaj litaratury**. Radakcyjnaja kalehija: V. V. Barysionak, P. U. Brouka, M. S. Lyńkou. Minsk, 1956.

⁵ Vitali Volski. **Narysy pa historyi bielaruskaj litaratury epochi feodalizma**, Minsk, 1958, p. 5.

STUDIES ON DOCTOR FRANCIS SKARYNA IN THE WEST SINCE WORLD WAR II

John Sadouski
Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

Skaryna's great contribution to the development of Byelorussian culture has been generally recognized. Articles on his life and works have appeared since the eighteenth century. The first Western scholar who mentioned Skaryna is rightly considered to have been S. W. Ringeltaube. In 1744 he briefly discussed the "abuses" of Skaryna's Bible made by Symon Budny, a sixteenth-century Byelorussian writer, translator, and prominent Unitarian polemist.¹ Unfortunately, Ringeltaube's example has been followed by only a handful of Western scholars in the course of over two centuries. It was not until the end of the Second World War that numerous studies on Skaryna were undertaken in the West, and these culminated in several important discoveries.

Francis² Skaryna, the scholar humanist and the first Byelorussian printer-editor, was born in Połacak (Polatsk) about 1485, the son of a well-to-do merchant, and died in 1540 in Prague, Bohemia. It may be assumed that he received his primary and secondary education in his native city. There is documentary evidence that Skaryna graduated from the University of Cracow with the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy in 1506 and obtained the degree of Doctor of Medicine at the University of Padua in 1512. In the documents of the latter university Francis Skaryna is called Doctor of Arts. All efforts to find out the name of the university which must have granted him this degree have so far been unsuccessful.

Doctor Skaryna became famous for his translation into Byelorussian, comments, and printing of books of religious content "for the good of the common people". It is known that he practised his medical profession in Byelorussia and elsewhere.

In the years from 1517 to 1519 Doctor Skaryna translated the Bible into Byelorussian³ and printed it in Prague. There are indications that he translated the entire Bible, but only twenty-three books of the Old Testament printed by him in Prague are known. In Vilna, the capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania,

then a very important center of Byelorussian culture, Doctor Skaryna printed in 1522 *The Little Traveller's Book* (*Małaja podorožnaja knižka*), a prayer book for travelling Orthodox laymen with Psalms and a Calendar, and in 1525 *The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles* (*Apostol*).

Francis Skaryna was a very keen traveller. In addition to Poland, Italy, and Bohemia, he lived in Denmark and Prussia, made a trip to the Grand Duchy of Moscow, and there are indications that he was in Germany, Austria, and possibly in several other countries.

Although Doctor Skaryna is the most outstanding representative of Byelorussian culture of the sixteenth century, little is known about his life because of numerous gaps in documentary evidence. In the past, unfavorable political conditions in Byelorussia hindered scholars in their study of Skaryna's works. But since the Second World War East European and Western slavists have been engaged in serious research on him. The present survey, however, will be limited to studies conducted in the West only.

With his article "A Great Son of A Great Nation — Francis Skaryna", which appeared in Germany in 1947,⁴ J. Vičbič initiated a series of short popular publications of émigré Byelorussian printer-editor, was born in Połacak (Polatsk) about 1485, attempt at scholarly research was made by Dr. Vitaŭt Tumaš (Tumash) in 1952, the year of publication of his article "Skaryna's Portrait in Padua".⁶ In the following year the same author published, under the pseudonym Symon Braha (which he often employed in subsequent years), an article entitled "King Albrecht and Skaryna: Documents Belonging to the State Archives of Königsburg".⁷ It contains a Byelorussian translation of the documents relating to Skaryna's stay in that city in 1530, made by P. Tatarynovic, preceded by an historical introduction by S. Braha. Unfortunately, the original Latin text of these documents is not printed.

In 1960 the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, New York, sponsored the present author's stay in Padua for research in the university and city archives and for the study of Skaryna's portrait at the university of Padua. As a result a photographic reproduction, a transcription, and a Byelorussian translation of four Latin documents referring to Skaryna's doctoral examination at the University, including two Italian entries and a photograph of his portrait were published *žnič*.⁸ The transcription and translation, which were made by P. Tatarynovič, contain several omissions and some errors.

In 1962, in his article "Doctor Skaryna in Moscow", V. Tumaš studied the first Byelorussian printer's journey to Moscow in great detail. J. Pervolf raised the probability of this journey towards the end of the nineteenth century.¹⁰ V. Tumaš, who

emerges as a foremost authority on Skaryna, argues convincingly that Doctor Francis Skaryna went to the capital of the Grand Duchy of Moscow between 1525 and 1533. His books, which he took with him, on the order of the Grand Duke of Moscovy, Vasilij Ivanovich, were burned publicly in Moscow as heretical. During the same year the author published another article, "Doctor Skaryna's Portraits".¹¹ There he analyzes the three variants of Skaryna's woodcut portraits found in his books of the Bible printed in Prague and describes the painted portrait at the University of Padua.

The present author defended two doctoral dissertations: one, entitled **Francesco Skaryna**, at the University of Rome in 1964 and the other, entitled **A Linguistic Analysis of the Four Books of Kings Printed by Skaryna in 1518**, at the University of London in 1967. The former thesis is concerned with the life and works of the first Byelorussian printer; the latter contains separate chapters on the various opinions held on Skaryna's language, on the grammar and the vocabulary of his Four Books of Kings, as well as a discussion of the language employed in these books.

The best account of the sources for the biography of Doctor Francis Skaryna can be found in V. Tumaš's article "The Geographical Location of Doctor Skaryna's Biography".¹² The author avails himself of numerous documents concerning Skaryna, his family and relatives, and of previous research. He briefly sketches the historical background which enables us to gain a better understanding of the great doctor's life and works. The principal merit of Tumaš's article is the discovery of two new locations: Denmark and Wrocław (Breslau). V. Tumaš was the first to establish that Skaryna was Secretary to King Hans of Denmark and that on his way from Prague to Vilna in 1520 he passed through Wrocław, where his books were confiscated.

The article, "A Discussion of Doctor Skaryna's First Name in the Light of Documents and Literature",¹³ also by V. Tumaš, may have convinced Soviet Byelorussian scholars to accept the name **Francišak** since irrefutable arguments were adduced that the name **George** was erroneous and never used by Doctor Skaryna.

G. Pichura's article "The Engravings of Francis Skaryna in the 'Biblija Ruska' (1517-1519)",¹⁴ reveals that Skaryna's works compare favorably with West European printers and engravers of the same period. It stresses Doctor Skaryna's extraordinary abilities and the high artistic value of his printed books. The article also contains a summary of biographical data and a brief review of previous studies of his engravings. Pichura's opinion about the sources on which Skaryna drew is of great interest.

In his article "Skaryna's Stay in Denmark"¹⁵ the present author confirms the conclusion reached by V. Tumaš five years before that Skaryna was Secretary to King Hans of Denmark. The original Latin text of the manuscript *Doctoratum*, kept in the archives of the Bishop of Padua, in which Skaryna is called "Secretary of the Danish King" — "*secretarii regis datiae*" — and an English translation are published. The relevant passages from three letters sent in response to my inquiries, from Professor E. Lo Gatto of the University of Rome, from the Royal Library, and the Record Office, both in Copenhagen, are quoted.

Among the publications relating to Skaryna which have appeared in the West since the Second World War, the most outstanding is Volume 5 (1970) of *The Anna's (Zapisy)* of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences published on the occasion of the 450th Anniversary of Skaryna's printing. The 268-page volume is entirely devoted to Doctor Francis Skaryna and is appropriately entitled *Scoriniana 1517-1967*. It contains four articles, six short communications, a review of publications, and a bibliography up to 1970 which includes documents and original works. We shall briefly examine each item.

V. Tumaš's article, "Doctor Francišak Skaryna (1485?-1540),"¹⁶ is a synthesis of his previous publications on the great doctor's life. The division of the article into thirteen parts, each with its own subtitle, facilitates the search for information. The article also contains a photographic reproduction of five pages from Skaryna's books and of the open letter, written in Czech, of Ferdinand I, King of Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary, given to Doctor Skaryna's son, Simeon Rus, in 1552.

Another article by V. Tumaš, "Skaryna in Padua",¹⁷ concentrates on the documents referring to Skaryna kept in the various archives of that city. The discovery of the documents and the history of the University of Padua are briefly traced. Tumaš also discusses the question of Skaryna's medical practice and stresses the fact that his stay in Italy was not an exception, since some of his countrymen studied in Italian universities as early as the end of the fifteenth century. He publishes a photographic reproduction of four Latin documents referring to Skaryna's doctoral examination at the University as well as two Italian entries; a transcription and a Byelorussian translation, accompanied by the author's footnotes, are included.

J. Dobrowsky's hypothesis that a sixteenth-century Italian linguist, Theseus Ambrosius Albonesi (Teseo Ambrogio degli Albonesi), quoted a passage from Skaryna's printed book as early as 1539, as an example of the Cyrillic alphabet used by several Slavs, is proved to be correct by V. Tumaš in his article, "Skaryna's Books in Italy in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century."¹⁸ Furthermore, Tumaš establishes that the passage was taken from Skaryna's *Second Book of Kings*. Photographic repro-

ductions of the relevant passages from Albonesi's work and Skaryna's book are published. Although Albonesi transliterated Skaryna's text into the Latin alphabet, identity of the two passages is obvious. Finally, Tumaš discusses various possibilities to explain how Skaryna's books could have reached Italy and come into the hands of the prominent Italian linguist as early as 1539.

The Byelorussian translation of a chapter from the present author's doctoral thesis, entitled **A Linguistic Analysis of Four Books of Kings Printed by Skaryna in 1518**, constitutes the basis of the article "Lexical Peculiarities of Skaryna's Four Books of Kings".¹⁹ Non-Church Slavic words, namely Byelorussian, Czech, German, and Polish, are listed. Byelorussian words are very numerous, since Skaryna translated the Bible into a language close to his native tongue. The Czech section is much longer than the Polish or German, since Skaryna certainly consulted the Czech Bible of 1506.

The Latin text of two privileges and a Byelorussian translation by P. Tatarynovič are printed in a brief communication.²⁰ In his introduction V. Tumaš explains the significance of the privileges granted by King Sigismund I in 1532; these exempted Francis Skaryna from the jurisdiction of all the courts of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and put him under the jurisdiction of the King himself.

The communication, "Anniversary Scoriniana", consists of four short sections:²¹ two are signed with the initials S. B., the third with the initials V. Z., and the name of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences appears at the end of the last communication. The sections are: 1. "The Anniversary of Byelorussian Printing", i. e., the 450th anniversary; 2. "The Exhibition at the New York Public Library"; 3. "The Anniversary of Printing in the Byelorussian S.S.R."; and 4. "Doctor Skaryna's First Name". Although all four parts impart new and interesting information, the most important is the third.

The article about Anton Vasilevič Florovski, who died in Prague in 1968, an historian and prominent scholar on Francis Skaryna, is written by V. Tumaš.

The last two articles, both by V. Tumaš, also, are especially significant. One, entitled "Scoriniana nova",²² is an excellent, very concise, review of major studies on Skaryna published between 1926 and 1966. It can be considered a continuation of a similar review by U. Pičeta which appeared in 1926. Tumaš's other article, entitled "Bibliography of Scoriniana",²⁴ is the most complete bibliography, embracing the period from 1492 to 1970, on the first Byelorussian printer, and recording nearly 1200 bibliographical entries. It lists relevant documents, Skaryna's printed books and their manuscript copies, literature, as well as literary and artistic works about Skaryna. The bibliography is prefaced by an interesting and informative introduction, which

indicates the location of documents, Skaryna's books, and their manuscript copies. If a document was published, the relevant bibliographical data are indicated. Many entries have brief explanatory notes.

The following publications may be considered to continue V. Tumaš's bibliography from 1967 to date:

The year of publication of Skaryna's *The Little Traveller's Book* in Vilna was determined by A. Nadson in his article "Skaryna's Book in Copenhagen";²⁵ it is 1522. Previously, scholars had advanced several hypotheses. The most popular was that the book had been published around 1525. In another article, "Skaryna's Prayer Book",²⁶ Nadson gives a detailed description of *The Little Traveller's Book*. The article contains several photographic reproductions from the book and from other Slavic publications in the same category.

Italian scholar, Claudio Bellinati, published an article in 1967 about documents concerning Francis Skaryna, found recently in the Old Archives of the Bishopric of Padua, — "La laurea di Skorina nella Biblioteca Vescovile".²⁷ An article was published in Rome in 1968 written by Bishop Česlaŭ Šipovič,²⁸ which discusses Skaryna's Byelorussian translation of the Bible.

In 1974 a Byelorussian translation of an English paper, "The Seizure of Skaryna's Books in Wrocław", delivered by V. Tumaš at the Byelorussian Study Weekend held in April 1971 at Queen's University at Kingston, Canada, was published.²⁹ It is a detailed description of Skaryna's passage through Wrocław in 1520. The same author published an article in 1972 about Skaryna's Calendar, printed 1522 in Vilna.³⁰ In 1977 a report was printed on V. Tumaš's research on "Skaryna's Books in Western Europe in his Time and Today".³¹ This article provides a review of what is known about Skaryna's books (or fragments of them) in libraries of the West: in Prague, Königsberg, Pavia, Wrocław (Breslau), Ljubljana, London, Cambridge, Copenhagen. At the end of the article a table indicates where and how many copies of each of these editions have been preserved.

It should be mentioned that during the years 1962-1977 there appeared in *The Annals (Zapisy)* of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences several important reviews of recent publications concerning Francis Skaryna by the Academy of Sciences of the Byelorussian S.S.R. in Minsk and by the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. in Moscow.

The efforts of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York, especially those of its President, Dr. Vitaŭt Tumaš,³² and of the Francis Skaryna Byelorussian Library and Museum in Finchley, London, England, to collect material of every kind of the first Byelorussian printer have been remarkable.

The Institute has acquired microfilms of more than half of Skaryna's books, and microfilms or photomechanical copies of most documents as well as many important publications concerning him. It has also assisted the New York Public Library in obtaining microfilms of Skaryna's original Books and making xerox copies of **The Little Traveller's Book**; these are the only complete copies extant. The collection of Scoriniana at the Francis Skaryna Library and Museum in London is also considerable.

The contribution to the study of Doctor Francis Skaryna made by Western Slavists during the last twenty-five years has been recognized by Soviet scholars who avail themselves of the discoveries made and the conclusions reached by Western researchers, but more often than not without quoting the source.

As has been mentioned, the main achievements of scholars in the West are: the discovery of two cities, Copenhagen and Wrocław, as important for Skaryna's biography; the finding of Skaryna's **Paskalia**; the determination of the year 1522 as the year of publication of **The Little Traveller's Book**, and the time of establishing the first printing workshop in Byelorussia and all Eastern Europe; the discovery of Skaryna's portrait at the University of Padua.

We can be sure that in the coming years Western researchers will discover new documents and facts relating to Doctor Francis Skaryna, which will enable them to fill further gaps in our knowledge of the life and works of the prominent Byelorussian humanist, scholar, and printer of the Renaissance.

NOTES

¹ S. Ringeltaube, **Gruendliche Nachricht von polnischen Bibeln**, Danzig, 1744, p. 170.

² The name **Frañcišak** (Francis), is now in general use. However, the name **George** was sometimes erroneously employed, either by itself or together with Francis.

³ The great majority of scholars consider Skaryna's language to be Old Byelorussian. However because of considerable Church Slavonic elements in it, some are of the opinion that it should be called "Byelorussian version of Church Slavonic".

⁴ J. Vićbič, **Vialiki syn vialikaha narodu — Frañcišak Skaryna**, **Šypšyna** 4(1947):31-35.

⁵ See, for example, **Bačkaŭščyna** 64(1950):3; 65(1951):3 and **Vieda** 2(1951):61.

⁶ V. Tumaš, **Partret Skaryny ŭ Padui**, **Zapisy**, Bielaruski Instytut Navuki i Mastactva, 1(1952):40-44.

⁷ S. Braha, **Karol Albrecht i Skaryna**. **Dokumenty z Dziaržaŭnaha Archivu u Karaleucy**, **Zapisy** 3(4)(1953):108-13. N.B. The Byelorussian "Karaleviec" in German is Königsberg. Since World War II the city is called Kaliningrad.

- 8 **Znič** 56(1960):7-8; 61(1961):6-7; 62-63(1961):10; 64-65(1962):12.
- 9 S. Braha, Doktor Skaryna u Maskvie, **Zapisy** 2(1963):9-36.
- 10 I. Pervolf, Slavianie, ikh vzaimnyje otnošienija i sviazi, Warsaw, 1888, II, pp. 596-597.
- 11 S. Braha, Partrety doktora Skaryny, Bielaruski Instytut Navuki j Mastactva, **Konadni** 7 (1963):138-51.
- 12 S. Braha, Hieahrafičnaja lakalizacyja žyćciapisu doktora Skaryny, **Zapisy**, 3(1964):9-33.
- 13 S. Braha, Pytańnie imia doktora Skaryny u šviate aktau i literatury", **Zapisy** 4(1966):184-215.
- 14 G. Pichura, The Engravings of Francis Skaryna in the 'Biblija Ruska' (1517-1519), **The Journal of Byelorussian Studies** 1(1967):147-67. Pichura is the pseudonym of Guy de Picarda.
- 15 J. Sadouski, Skaryna's Stay in Denmark, **The Journal of Byelorussian Studies** 2(1969):25-28.
- 16 S. Braha, Doktor Frańcišak Skaryna (1485?-1540), **Zapisy** 5(1970):11-33.
- 17 V. Tumaš, u Padui, **Ibid.**, pp. 35-79.
- 18 V. Tumaš, Knihi Skaryny u Italii peršaje palaviny XVI stahodgždzja, **Ibid.**, pp. 81-89.
- 19 J. Sadouski, Leksyčnyja asablivašci Knihi Carstvau Skaryny **Ibid.**, pp. 91-111.
- 20 P. Tatarynovič and V. Tumaš, Skarynavyja krakauskija pryvilejnyja hramaty 1532 hodu, **Ibid.**, pp. 113-130.
- 21 Uhodkavaja skarynijana, **Ibid.**, pp. 121-36. N.B. The page reference for each part is as follows: 1. 121-123; 2. 124-129; 3. 129-133; 4. 133-136.
- 22 V. Tumaš, Anton Vasilevič Flarouski, **Ibid.**, pp. 137-143.
- 23 V. Tumaš, Scoringiana nova, **Ibid.**, pp. 145-180.
- 24 V. Tumaš, compiler, Bibliahrafija skarynijany, **Ibid.**, pp. 181-260.
- 25 A. Nadson, Kniha Skaryny u Kapenhahienie, **Božym Šlacham** 128(1971):9-11.
- 26 A. Nadson, Skaryna's Prayer Book, **The Journal of Byelorussian Studies** 2(1972):339-358.
- 27 Claudio Bellinati, La laurea di Skorina nella Biblioteca Vescovile, **L'Avvenire d'Italia** 28 Gennaio, 1967.
- 28 Ceslao Sipovič, Il dottore Francesco Skaryna ■ la sua opera biblica, **Unitas** Aprile-Giugno, Roma 1968, pp. 126-138.
- 29 V. Tumaš, Kanfiskata u Vroclavie knihau Bibliji Skaryny, **Zapisy** 12(1974):3-13.
- 30 S. Braha, Bielaruskamu kalendaru 450 hadou, **Biellarus** 188(1972):6.
- 31 V. Tumaš, Knihi Skaryny na Zachadzie Europy u paru jahonuju j siańnia, **Zapisy** 15(1977):23-53.
- 32 In 1962 a report on the holdings of the Institute was published. See Skarynijana u BINiM'ie, **Biellarus** 75(1962):4.

ON THE PROBLEM OF COMMON BYELORUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN PHONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

George Y. Shevelov
Columbia University

Much has been written on Belorussian-Ukrainian linguistic relationships, but these studies have mostly concentrated on the delimitation of Belorussian and Ukrainian medieval texts.¹ The present notice only treats convergences and some divergences in the phonological developments of the two languages, and even this is done rather by allusions to facts known to the reader, with a minimum of examples, than by extensive presentation of the problems involved.

Belorussian has more sound changes shared or identical with Ukrainian than with any other Slavic language. It is easy to draw the conclusion of close proximity of the two "sister languages." But such a statistical approach is superficial and misleading and such conclusions hasty and simplistic. The reality was more complicated. A differentiated approach is required.

The striking fact is that during the Proto-Ukrainian period² there was not a single sound change which Proto-Ukrainian dialects shared with Belorussian alone, taken as a whole. One part

¹ The bibliography of the question may be found, e.g., in U. Ani-čenka. *Belaruska-wkrainskija pis'mova-mownyja suvjazi*, Minsk 1969, p. 18ff and in my article "Belorussian versus Ukrainian", *The Journal of Byelorussian Studies*, III, 2(1974), pp. 145, 154ff.

² The periodization applied here is based on the external history of the Ukrainian language and goes as follows: Proto-Ukrainian, before the appearance of the earliest written texts, i.e., the mid-11th century; Old Ukrainian, until the end of the 14th century; Early Middle Ukrainian, approximately until the Union of Lublin, 1569; and Middle Ukrainian, approximately until the time following the battle of Poltava, around 1720. For the purposes of this article it did not seem expedient to raise some debatable questions concerning the periodization of the history of the Belorussian language.

of the sound changes encompassed what we now call South Belorussian only. Such are the retention of *kv* before *ě* (*kvétka*), the change of unstressed *ę* to *e* (*drévec*), the dispalatalization of *r'* (*zver*), the change of *ě* to *iE* (*lěta*), and probably the admittance of *sk* before *ě* (*skepac*). None of these changes took place in North Belorussian. Another set of changes extended to North Belorussian as well but was not limited to it: the palatalization of *x* into *s'* (*múxa*: *múse*, and not **mušě*), the simplification of *ž* into *s'* (*mjažá*), the change of *j* to *l'* after labials (*ljubljú*), the loss of *t* and *d* before *l* (*kladú*: *kław*, *klála*), pleophony and metathesis in word-initial *oASC*-sequences³ (*maróz*, *równy*), the loss of phonemic pitch and length, the change of stressed *ę* to *'a* (*pjac*) and *o* to *u* (*sud*), the loss of *j* before *u-* and *o-* (Old Belorussian *unyi*, *ozero*, Modern *júny*, *vózera*) were all shared with Russian or, in some cases, Russian and Bulgarian; the retention of *i* (*pi*, from older *pij*) and *u* (changed to *y*: *mýju*) before *j* without a change to jers, with Polish, Slovak, and Bulgarian. In the labialization of *eA* to *'o* (*lěd*), both South Belorussian and North Belorussian had in common the rise of *'o* after all consonants, but the kernel of the change common with (North) Ukrainian, having the switch only after postdentals and *j* (*žónka*), was also shared with Proto-Russian or part of it.

Moreover, among the specific features which "South Belorussian" shared with Ukrainian listed above, all except possibly one were actually not shared with Ukrainian as a whole but only with its northern part. Only the change of *ě* to *iE* probably was originally represented in Proto-South-Ukrainian as well but only for a short time. While in North Ukrainian *iE* was to stay, in South Ukrainian it soon monophthongized into *e*.

Thus, in reality, none of these changes was common Belorussian-Ukrainian in the strict sense of the word, i.e., all-Ukrainian and all-Belorussian and limited to these two languages. All those which did not cover a broader area occurred in a specific dialectal unit which I have suggested labeling Kiev-Polessian.⁴ Later this unit was eroded: its northern part was involved in the formation of Belorussian, its southern part, in the formation of Ukrainian. The illusion of early common Belorussian-Ukrainian developments springs from the presence of common features in both languages. But these common features are due to the "partition" of the Kiev-Polessian dialects between the two languages.

The situation described here extended well into the Old

³ In this formula and the following ones *C* stands for any consonants, *S*, for any sonant.

⁴ In J. Šerech, *Problems in the Formation of Belorussian*, New York, 1953, pp. 17, 91ff.

Ukrainian period. The set of essentially Kiev-Polessian developments then included the diphthongization of *e* and *o* in the newly-closed syllables (*piEč*, *dvuOr*), a similar treatment of the newly-formed clusters postdental + dental (*knížcy* = [kn'ízcy]), and the rise of new vowels in two-sonority-peak syllables (types *iržá*, *kryvávy*). The second set of changes, those shared with Ukrainian but also with some other Slavic languages, comprised the change of *y* to *i* after *g*, *k* and *x* (*ruki*), the loss of weak jers and the replacement of strong jers by *o* and *e* (*dzen'* : *dnja*, *son* : *snu*), the treatment of the sequences *C_L/LSC* (*horb*) the voicing throughout in the clusters voiceless + voiced (*malac'bá* = [malaz'bá]), the dispalatalization of palatalized dentals before dentals (*hódny*, *smútny* type), and the spirantization of *g* into Greek gamma.

But some new characteristics earmarked the phonological development and the distribution of dialects at that time. In some changes apparently common for a broader area, a considerable time-lag is observed in the north, e.g., in the treatment of *ky*, *gy*, and *xy*, in the loss of jers, and others, ranging from a century to two, which actually precludes considering them as common changes: they are rather separate changes with common results. If these are excluded, the number of common changes shrinks substantially. Some important sound changes began appearing which were actually Belorussian-Ukrainian (in the full sense of the terms) and only that: the identical treatment of "jers" before *j* (barring differences in a few minor details as Br *salavéj* — U *solovéj/solovíj*), the introduction of the alternation *u* : *v* (*w*), and the dispalatalization of syllable-final labials (*sem*, *cěmny*). The number of these was limited. Nevertheless, their appearance is significant. It testifies to the growing consolidation of originally variegated dialects into two languages and to the presence of stronger ties between these two languages than between them and other contiguous Slavic idioms.

In the Early Middle Ukrainian period, when the two nationalities found themselves in the state of Lithuania, the number of common changes grew: the labialization of *l* into *w* (*vowk*), a prothetic *v* before *o*- and *u*- (*vózera*, *vúlíca*), the loss of the word-final postconsonantal *l* in verbs of past tense (*hryz*, from *hryzl*), the gemination of consonants in place of the clusters *C' + j* (*py-tannje*) possibly the dispalatalization of postdentals (*noč*, *njasěš*). On the other hand, specific Kiev-Polessian developments virtually ceased: one can only mention the voicing of consonants in word-final position and before a voiceless consonant wherever this was morphologically justified (*dzed*, *dzjadjkí* with [d], not [t]). Yet, the newly imposed Lithuanian-Polish frontier which ran across the Ukraine caused some sound changes which were expanding from the north to stop short at that line: the labialization of *l*, the voicing of voiceless consonants in certain positions, the gem-

ination of palatalized consonants, the sporadic unrounding of unstressed *o* into *a* (Ukr. *bahátyj*), possibly also the dispalatalization of postdentals. (There were also sound changes southwest of the frontier whose expansion was arrested or slowed down at the border of the Polish part of the Ukraine). Only one sound change encompassed the entire Ukraine but only the south of Belorussia: the dispalatalization of prevocalic palatalized labials ([*m'ása*] > [*mjása*]). It is also important that for that period the student can, at least for some sound changes, establish their origin in Belorussian and their subsequent spread into Ukrainian: the labialization of *l* and probably the dispalatalization of postdentals; in the Middle Ukrainian period, the dispalatalization, in the North Ukrainian dialects, of *c'* (*kanéc*).

In the 16th century a new type of apparently common Belorussian-Ukrainian development was inaugurated: a sound change in Ukrainian which was patterned on the status quo (not on a change) in Belorussian: this clearly applies to the sporadic unrounding of *o* in the pretonic syllable before a stressed *a* (*bahátyj*) and may apply to the labialization of *e* into *o* after dentals (Br *léd*, Ukr *l'odu*) and to the change *y* into *i* after *j* and word-initially (Ukr *mojí*, *istóta*). Sound changes of that type were rooted in Ukrainian. But Belorussian, in all likelihood, played the part of a catalyst.

Thus, common features of Belorussian and Ukrainian are due partly to the bilateral erosion of the Kiev-Polessian dialects between the two languages, partly to actual common developments, and partly to the catalytic action of Belorussian on Ukrainian developments. The actual common developments of Belorussian and Ukrainian fall between the mid-thirteenth and the seventeenth centuries, but they were of greater concentration and major importance from the mid-fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth century, i.e., at the time of the stabilized supremacy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania over a great part of the Ukraine. Even at that time, though, a great many Belorussian-Ukrainian sound changes stopped at the Lithuanian-Polish frontier. As for the ties between the Belorussian and Ukrainian phonological developments in the broader context of Slavdom, they were strong in the prehistorical period as well as later.

April, 1977

THE VISUAL ARTS IN BYELORUSSIAN COMMUNITIES IN THE WEST

Raisa Žuk-Hryškievič

The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in Canada

INTRODUCTION

During World War II Byelorussians, dispersed throughout Central Europe, were constantly on the move. There was little time for artistic activity. The main concern was survival. But even then, at one of the socio-cultural meetings in Berlin, Mr. Žmitra Čajkoŭski amazed everyone by a display of expressive portraits of prominent members of Byelorussian society present at the gathering.

When the war was over, Byelorussians—displaced persons and political émigrés—were gathered in DP camps in the British, American, and French zones of West Germany and Austria. In the Byelorussian DP camps, social and cultural life began to pulsate immediately after their formation. Schools, youth organizations, churches, medical and dental clinics were established. The need for the publication of textbooks and periodicals became obvious. Printing facilities were not available. Their place had to be taken by Gestetners. With publication possible again, the visual arts—graphics and drawings—re-emerged. One artist whose work began to appear was the high-school teacher, Časlaŭ Budźka. Among his other works, a graphically embellished edition of the “Apocrypha” by Maksim Bahdanovič, stands out as a fine work of art, lovingly and beautifully executed. Another artist from this period is Janka Skarachod. He illustrated the fairy-tale book *Muzyka i Čerci*, The Musician and the Devils, published by the Whiteruthenian Publishers, Goslar, 1947.

In the Byelorussian DP camps in the American Zone of West Germany, the graphic artists Aleksandra Ramanouški, Barys Daniluk, Advardy Šabunia, and the painters Žmitra Čajkoŭski, Lidyja Kalinoŭskaja, and Mikoła Kruhłovič were active.

In Austria Piotra Miranovich was studying painting at the Academy of Art in Vienna. Another Byelorussian painter, Mr. George Leŭčuk, illustrated the collection of poetry of a Byelorussian poet, Aleś Saławiej.

Towards the end of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s, Byelorussians from West Germany and Austria emigrated to England, France, Australia, Canada, and the United States. New York, Chicago, and several cities in New Jersey became centers of Byelorussian communities in the USA; Toronto and Montreal in Canada; Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide in Australia. In each country, in fact, in each city Byelorussian communities organized themselves and developed in somewhat different ways and in various directions, depending on the community in its local *spiritus movens*.

In the year 1951 the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences was formed in New York. It gathered around itself writers, intellectuals, and artists, and stimulated the cultural life of the Byelorussian community in the United States and elsewhere in the West.

AUSTRALIA

One of the most prominent Byelorussian artists in Australia was **Aleksandra Ramanouŭski** (1915-1955). Born and educated in Vitsebsk, Byelorussia, he graduated from the Vitsebsk School of Art in 1938. He later worked as an art teacher, a decorator in the theater, and a newspaper cartoonist. In 1940 he was drafted into the Red Army and sent to the front in Finland, where he was taken as a prisoner of war by the Germans in 1941.

After the war Ramanouŭski was active as an artist in Germany and later in Australia. His political cartoons were published in the Byelorussian weekly *Bačkaŭščyna* (West Germany), *Novaje Źyćcio* (Australia), and in some Russian periodicals. His works were also reproduced in the Byelorussian literary periodical, *Konadni* (Vigils) (1). Fourteen of his sketches in brush India-ink were edited in a separate publication under the title "Iron Curtain Sketches by Aleksander Romanowski" in Sidney, Australia, in 1955. In September of that year he exhibited his works for the last time together with 29 other Australian artists at an art exhibition sponsored by the Australian Art Club (of which he was a member) in September, 1955, in Sydney, where his work "The Grey Day" found particular favor with the public. He forwarded ten of his sketches in India-ink to the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York.

In his cartoons and sketches, such as "The Dead Village," "The Shootings in the Back," and "Lenin" Aleksandra Ramanouŭski expressed his protest and indignation against the political tyranny under which his native Vitsebsk and all of Byelorussia had found itself since the year 1919. As a political cartoonist and caricaturist, Ramanouŭski is unique in the history of Byelorussian pictorial art in the West. His sketches of few lines and strokes have intensity of expression. One senses in them the assured and

able hand of the artist and his feeling for organization and rhythm.

Some of Ramanoŭski's works were shown at a group exhibition of works by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York (2).

Regrettably in the midst of promising artistic growth, the life of Aleksandra Ramanoŭski was cut short under tragic circumstances at the age of 40 (3).

BELGIUM

Michal Saŭka-Michalski born in Byelorussia in the district of Mir, came to Belgium after World War II (4). During the war, as a boy of 16, he enrolled at the Art School of Baranavičy, Byelorussia. To support himself in Belgium Saŭka-Michalski worked in a mine. At the same time he continued his education by attending night classes at the Academy of Art, where, for the first time, he received a prize for his work. In 1950 he joined a group of Byelorussian students, who studied at the University of Louvain, enrolling in the Institute of Archeology and Art History, and in the meantime continuing to paint. Portraits in oil of his fellow students, Père Robert, the artist's wife, and his self-portrait are from this period. He graduated from school in 1956. Presently he is employed by the Belgian Ministry of Culture where he devotes himself to the restoration of historical monuments of art in Belgium. While restoring polychrome sculptures in wood, frescos, and tempera, he became interested in, and began to study different techniques of painting in various media and different periods of history beginning with the 3rd century A.D. onwards.

Presently he lives with his family in Brussels, painting for the most part in tempera. In his painting "Different Interests," instead of passages of gold applied and burnished to the gesso, Saŭka-Michalski uses silver leaf. Several of his paintings in tempera—portraits and icons—were exhibited at the second group exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York, November 28-December 31, 1976.

CANADA

In Canada the first art show of a Byelorussian artist was organized by the Byelorussian Canadian Women's Association in November of 1969, in the Byelorussian Community Center, 524 St. Clarens Avenue, Toronto. The exhibition featured 40 works by **Halina Rusak** from New Jersey, landscape and still-life paintings in oil and acrylics (5).

Later in June of 1972 and again in 1974 the Byelorussian pavilion "Miensk," in Toronto's Metro International Caravan

presented exhibits of art works by **Ivonka Survilla** from Ottawa, **Piotra Miranovich** from New York, and **Viktar Žaŭniarovič** from Paris, France, sponsored by the Byelorussian Canadian Youth Association (6).

A Byelorussian-Canadian artist **Ivonka Survilla** arrived in Canada from Spain in 1969. Born in Western Byelorussia in 1936, she spent most of her youth in Paris, France, where she studied art at L'Ecole Superieure de Beaux-Arts in Paris, under Jean Souverbie. From this training she derives her ability to grasp and express the most difficult and subtle of all forms, that of the human body. Ivonka Survilla is mainly a portrait and human figure painter. She works in oil, watercolors, pencil, charcoal, pen, collage, and appliqué, but she is most accomplished in drawing. Some of her portraits are executed with only a few lines, not simply describing the appearance, but also expressing the personality and mood of the sitter. As the expressive element in her drawings is the line, so in her paintings it is predominantly color. The organization of colors blends with the organization of mostly well-defined planes and shapes, so that one element of expression reinforces the other, forming one compositional unit.

Another means of expression in her works is the use of pen with India ink. She models architecture, human bodies, and portraits into form, bit by bit, with pen strokes and crosshatching. Thus achieved, the lights and shades describe the form, convey the vitality of flesh, and express feelings, as in her "Woman," 1972. This exacting and demanding technique is a powerful and expressive element.

In her works, Ivonka Survilla declares that she wants to express beauty and order, goodness and kindness, as opposed to the evil of life. Her feelings toward her native Byelorussia are expressed in her rendering of historical monuments of Byelorussian architecture. With vision, a sense of organization, and accomplished technique in pen and India ink she restores the ruins—and with them the glory of the Byelorussian past—to a stately magnificence.

During the Tenth Biennial Convention of the Byelorussians of North America held in September, 1972, in Toronto, Canada, the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, Canada, sponsored an exhibition of works by Ivonka Survilla (7). From this exhibition one could deduce that the artist's source of inspiration is the marvel of nature—the human face and the human body. Faces are, in her rendering, serene or tearful, rarely happy and smiling; nudes are relaxed and assured in their dignity. If dressed, the robe gives a psychological and emotional accent. The notion of national identity and the emotion of love are mixed in the portrait "Biełaruska". Inexpressible in words, the psychological state and physical attraction of the sitter are expressed in the orange redness of the dress of Aní. This exhibition, which took

place in the Byelorussian Community Centre on St. Clarens Ave. in Toronto, was recorded in the book, **Canadian Artists in Exhibition 1972-73**, published in 1974 (8).

Ivonka Survilla has executed a number of portraits of celebrated Byelorussian women: Princess Pradsłava-St. Eufraścińnia of Polatsk, Alojza Paškevič-Ciotka, Paŭlinka Miadziołka, and in 16 gymnastic figures, Olga Korbut. This series was done for the Byelorussian-Canadian Women's Conference held in conjunction with the International Women's Year in December of 1975, in Toronto (9). Survilla has also participated in group exhibitions by Byelorussian artists in New York (3, 10).

FRANCE

For centuries France has been hospitable to the visual arts. It has also proved to be beneficial to Byelorussian talents, which emigrated there after World War II.

Michaś Naumovič was born in Byelorussia in 1922 (3, 10, 11 12). There he began his training in art under Ramaśkievič in Navahradak. Later, in the years 1947-1953, he studied art, particularly sculpture, at the École Nationale Supérieure des Beaux Arts in Paris, France, where he still lives. Naumovič is a sculptor and as such is accomplished in drawing and graphics; he paints in watercolor and oil, works in mosaic, at times as an architect, and is also a teacher. He lectures at the Higher School of Graphics, associated with the famous Academy Julian, and he is professor of the Anatomy of Morphology at the National School of Physiotherapy, which is under the jurisdiction of the French Ministry of Education.

Among several other prizes Michaś Naumovič has received is the "Prix Hugier" in the competition on knowledge of the anatomy of morphology from the École Nationale Supérieure des Beaux Arts in Paris in 1949. This prize entitled him to teach the Anatomy of Morphology. His numerous monumental sculptures are collated in different countries of Europe. His monumental sculpture in stone, 80 cm. high, of Jeanne d'Arc, is located in the church of Affoy près de Ham, north of Paris. The bas-relief, "The Wedding in Cana of Galilee," is in the French church in London, England. Several of his Madonnas carved in stone belong to a group of Art Sacré owned by churches in France. His sculpture in white stone — a monument on the grave of the Byelorussian composer Mikola Ravienski — is in Louvain, Belgium. His mosaic in marble on the Byelorussian coat of arms, Pahonia, now hangs in the Francis Skaryna Byelorussian Library and Museum in London, England. His superb watercolors of landscapes, portraits, and oils are in private collections in Europe and North America. His works in graphics include numerous designs for book covers, mainly for editions of **Bačkaŭščyna** such as **Novaja Ziamla** (The

New Land, 1952), *Spadčyna* (The Heritage, 1955) by Janka Kupała, *Symon Muzyka* (The Musician Simon, 1955) by Jakub Kolas, *La čužych bierahoŭ* (By Foreign Shores, 1955), *Vianok paetyčnaj spadčyny* (A Garland of Poetic Heritage, 1960) by Maksim Bahdanovič, and *Matčyn Dar* (My Mother's Gift, 1962) by Aleś Harun.

Michaś Naŭmovič participated in numerous art exhibits in France and in two group-shows of works by Byelorussian artists held in New York in 1973-74 and again in 1976. He is currently working on a monumental sculpture in stone of Doctor Francis Skaryna.

Uładzimier Šymaniec was born in 1911 in Riga, Latvia, of Byelorussian parents and died August 28, 1977 in Paris (3, 10, 13, 14, 15). In Byelorussia, he began painting at the age of 10 and participated in numerous school art shows. The fact that his paintings used to travel from one school art show to another indicates that his work was appreciated even at that early stage of his career. As a mature artist, however, he was most active in the years between 1932 — when he graduated from the Vilnia School of Technology—and 1936, when he started to raise a family. During World War II he won second prize at an exhibition of architectural projects in Baranavičy, Byelorussia. When foreign invaders forced him to leave his country, he chose to live in France. There he has participated in a number of exhibitions in Versailles and Sartrouville, where he was living. He took part in both of the group exhibitions of Byelorussian painters organized by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York.

Apart from the landscapes of Sartrouville, Uł. Šymaniec liked to record in his works aspects of his native Byelorussia which were particularly dear to him. He re-created Byelorussian landscapes and scenes from Byelorussia's past ("The Cathedral of Polatsk," "Museum in the Open" (Churches of Vilnia) and "Bisons of Bielavieža"). He also expressed his deep love and concern for his country in numerous writings on the topic of Byelorussian art (16).

Another Byelorussian artist who came to France at the end of the Second World War was Viktor Žaŭniarovič (2, 10, 17, 18, 19, 20). He was born in 1913 and grew up in the region of Brastlaŭ on the Dźvina river, from the banks of which he liked to paint in his youthful years, captured his heart and his imagination and he became a landscape painter for life. He arrived in France in 1945 and for a decade sustained himself as a laborer, painting little. Only towards the end of the 1950s did he start to paint again, and to exhibit and sell his works at art shows in Paris.

In 1962 the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York organized an exhibition featuring the works of Viktor Žaŭniarovič. The show included 47 paintings, 26 in gouache and 21 in oil. They were mostly landscapes and still life paintings. Žaŭniarovič's landscapes are not populated by people, but strange-

ly enough, their presence is felt very strongly in some of his paintings. His was probably the first art exhibition in New York of works by a Byelorussian artist. The exhibit was a considerable success. Later *Žaŭniarovič* commented: "This exhibition opened the American market to me." In 1965 *Žaŭniarovič* exhibited his works at the Art Gallery Lui Sulange in Paris, and participated after that in many art shows in Paris, such as: the Salon de Versal, the Salon d'Iver, the Salon des Artistes de France and others. He also received several prizes and "Mention" for his works. In the 1970s he participated in group shows of Byelorussian artists in New York and Canada (2, 10).

THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Žmitra Čajkoŭski, whose name has already been mentioned, was born in Kleck, Byelorussia. There he graduated from the Byelorussian high-school and received from a local artist elementary instruction in art. Later, in the years 1937-1939, he studied art at the Academy of Arts in Cracow, Poland; then the war interrupted his studies. Since World War II, he has lived in Germany. He is a genre, landscape, portrait, and ikon painter. His genre paintings were done in Byelorussia and portray Byelorussian country folk at work in the fields and the woods. *Žmitra Čajkoŭski* participated in the first group exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York in 1974 (2).

Anatol Čajkoŭski, son of *Žmitra Čajkoŭski*, has emerged in recent years as an active and accomplished painter and graphic artist in the Federal Republic of Germany. His latest works reveal strong characteristics of surrealism.

Mr. Piotra Syč, an outstanding newspaperman and writer who has lived in West Germany since the early 1950s, was a Byelorussian artist for whom art was an important political tool. He was a great caricaturist. Most Byelorussian journals of the post WW II era in Great Britain and West Germany carried many of his political caricatures and satirical sketches. Of particular interest are his caricatures in the Byelorussian satirical journal *Šarścień* (The Hornet) of which he was the editor and illustrator (21, 22).

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

After World War II considerable numbers of Byelorussians emigrated to the USA. New York became a major Byelorussian cultural center abroad. Founded in 1951, the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences played the leading part in promoting arts and letters. The Institute took upon itself the role of the "umbrella organization" of Byelorussian artists in the West; more

precisely, it became the major sponsor and patron of Byelorussian visual arts abroad. This partially explains, why in New York and New Jersey at least 20 artists are active at present. During the last decade about twenty art shows featuring the works of Byelorussian artists have been held in the USA. The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences has gathered artists around itself, encouraged them to develop their potential, commissioned their paintings, graphics, and sculptures, organized art shows, and published articles on art exhibitions, individual artists, and discrete works (2, 10, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26).

The first art exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences was mounted in 1962. It featured 47 paintings by **Viktar Žaŭniarovič** from Paris, France (2, 10, 17, 18, 19, 20).

In 1964 the Institute held another significant one-man exhibition, which featured the paintings by **Piotra Miranovich** (2, 10, 27, 28) the patriarch of Byelorussian painting in the West. Born in 1902 in the district of Džvinsk, he attended the Byelorussian high-school there and in 1936 graduated from the Latvian Academy of Arts in Riga.

In the years 1945-1947 Piotra Miranovich studied art at the Academy of Vienna in Austria. His works from this period are somewhat different in character from his previous work: the colors are brighter, the mood cooler, as though he painted them with detachment. The retrospective exhibition of Miranovich's works in 1964 in New York featured 63 paintings in oil: landscapes, genre paintings, still life, and portraits. A painting such as the double portrait, "The Neighbors," has the quality of arresting psychological beauty. Looking at it, one wishes to penetrate the inner world shared by the two neighbors. Many of Miranovich's landscapes are alive with the presence of people and animals. Some are lonely and dreamy; some, like "The Chapel," romantic, and cause one to shiver and reflect on the mystery of death.

In 1970 the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences sponsored another exhibition of works by Miranovich in connection with the Ninth Biennial Convention of Byelorussians of North America, which took place in New York. The most striking works in this exhibition were two portraits of Doctor **Francišak Skaryna**, the sixteenth-century humanist who initiated printing in 1522 in Byelorussia, establishing the first printing shop in all of Eastern Europe.

Piotra Miranovich, who presently lives in Brooklyn, New York, is the most important painter of historical portraits of Byelorussian celebrities, such as **Francišak Skaryna**, **Leŭ Sapieha**, **Kastuś Kalinoŭski**, **Janka Kupała**, **Piotra Krečėŭski**. These portraits were commissioned, some by various Byelorussian organizations, some by individuals. Miranovich's latest historical painting,

"Byelorussian Immigrants," was commissioned for the Bicentennial of the United States of America, and adorns the dust jacket of the **New Jersey Ethnic Experience**, edited by Barbara Cunningham, Wm. H. Wise & Co., Union City, New Jersey, 1977. Some of his paintings commissioned by the Byelorussian public, are devoted to Byelorussian themes and scenes; but he also paints delightful American landscapes. His style has changed with time. His brush strokes have become bolder, less controlled, the outlines of the forms more suggestive than descriptive. His "Park in Brooklyn" shimmers with light and colors that seem to melt into the foggy air of the sunny summer morning. The painting is almost impressionistic.

Piotra Miranovich is loved and admired for his works by his countrymen. Many Byelorussian homes in the United States and Canada proudly boast of owning paintings by this outstanding artist.

Skaryna's portrait became the subject matter of works by **Barys Daniluk**, who works in graphics (2, 10). Among his other works Daniluk designed the stamps, which were edited by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York in 1972 to commemorate the 450th anniversary of printing in Byelorussia. The component elements of the well-organized composition of the stamp are Skaryna's portrait taken from the woodcut of his Bible, and a traditional Byelorussian geometric pattern with inscriptions in Cyrillic characters.

The same of Skaryna's portrait provides the main theme for the seal-stamp designed by Barys Daniluk for the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, in New York, and for the bookplate designed for Dr. Vitaut Tumash, biographer and scholar of Doctor Francišak Skaryna and president of the Institute. Barys Daniluk was born and educated in Byelorussia, he now resides in New York.

Like most Byelorussian artists in the United States, **Halina Rusak** belongs to the younger generation. Born in Navahradak, Byelorussia, she was educated in Germany, Belgium, and the USA. Her interest and attention to painting evolved through her "desire to capture and retain the beauty of nature." At the beginning of Rusak's artistic career, the Byelorussian Canadian Women's Association sponsored an art show of her painting in Toronto, Canada, in November 1969 (5). At that time she was primarily a still life and landscape painter, although not in the traditional sense. Especially in the later stages of her development the outlines of the images in her paintings become more and more vague, sometimes completely disappearing and rendering the picture an abstract composition of colors.

The artist finally arrived at the style that is uniquely her own. Her recent paintings in oil and acrylic are two-dimensional compositions of well-defined planes and colors and stylized forms

of cornflowers, daisies, poppies, and ears of corn. Her painting, "Weeds that Beautify the Earth," 1973, is the synthesis of her belief that positive human values come from things that are "wild and free". Halina Rusak derives her inspiration and ideas from Byelorussian folk tradition and poetry. In addition to a one-woman show in Toronto, Rusak has had several exhibits in New Jersey and four in New York, three sponsored by the feminist art gallery SOHO 20 and one by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, New York (29, 30, 31, 32, 33). She also participated in the group exhibit of works by Byelorussian artists in New York (2, 10) and South River, New Jersey. She lives in Somerset, New Jersey.

Irene Rahalevich is another young artist currently professionally in the States (34). During the war as an infant she left her birthplace in Byelorussia with her parents and emigrated to the USA. She now lives and works in New Brunswick, New Jersey. A graduate of the York Academy of Arts in York, Pennsylvania, in the field of Commercial Art, Irene Rahalevich is presently employed as the Art Director in an advertising agency. She has had several art shows in Pennsylvania and in April-May of 1972 the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences sponsored an exhibition of her works in New York (35). It featured 54 paintings in oil, watercolors, tempera, pastels, lithographs, and serigraphs. These were primarily landscape-paintings. She also participated in the group exhibits of works by Byelorussian artists in New York and South River (2, 10).

Tamara Stahanovich-Kolba is another widely known and active Byelorussian artist. Born in Byelorussia St. Tamara came to the USA in 1950. She holds a Bachelor of Art Degree from Western College in Ohio, a Master of Fine Arts Degree from Columbia University, and has studied drawing, graphics, and lithography at the Art Students League in New York. She now lives in Tinton Falls, New Jersey.

"Art to me is life, and life is beauty in nature all around us. No matter what style an artist pursues, he or she is still influenced by nature, by its beauty, by its lines, shapes and colors" says St. Tamara.

St. Tamara is a versatile and productive artist working in different media and different techniques. She paints in oil, works in woodcuts, etchings, lithographs, and drawings, in which she excels. She is known for her illustrations of children's books, Byelorussian such as *Čytanka* by V. Pashkievich, and American such as *Prairie Dog*, *Animal Games*, and more recently *Come Visit a Prairie Dog Town*, written by Eugenia Alston and published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich in 1974. The illustrations are superbly executed drawings of animals against a scenic background, and are interesting and entertaining not only for their esthetic qualities, but also for their amusing personification of

animals, which have expressions and behave like children or adults.

The artist made a wood-cut portrait of Doctor Francišak Skaryna for the Exhibition of Byelorussian Printing sponsored by the New York Public Library in 1968 to commemorate the 450th anniversary of Byelorussian printing. She has painted a Christmas card for UNICEF, and the poster of trumpeting angel. St. Tamara has appeared in over one hundred art shows in 19 states, including Hawaii, and exhibits of works by Byelorussian artists. She has won numerous awards, the most recent two Graphic Awards at the Oklahoma Museum of Art; the International Woman's Year Award; First Prize at the Monmouth Arts Gallery; and three Honorable Mentions. She also holds a Gold Medal won in 1971 from the Catherine Lorillard Wolfe Art Club at the National Art Academy.

Ms. Tamara has had five one-woman shows, including one at the Avanti Galleries in New York, and has exhibited at the UNICEF Lever House, the Audubon Artists at the National Academy, and the National Arts Club, all in New York; the Davidson College National Print and Drawing Competition, Davidson, North Carolina, and the Hampshire Graphics Annual. Her paintings hang in Columbia University, the New York Public Library, California College in San Francisco, and in private collections in the USA, Europe, Canada, and South America. Her work has appeared in traveling exhibitions sponsored by the Hunterdon Arts Center, the Catherine Lorillard Wolfe Art Club of New York, and the Young Printmakers Show under the auspices of the Herron School of Art in Indianapolis, which toured in the United States for two years. She is an exhibiting member of the Guild of Creative Art.

St. Tamara is actively involved in the cultural life of the Byelorussian community. Recreating them from originals, she designed the traditional costumes from different regions of Byelorussia, and Byelorussian pottery for the Byelorussian Heritage Festivals at the Garden State Arts Center in June, 1976 and May, 1977 (2, 10, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40).

The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences organized in New York, an exhibition of paintings, drawings, graphics, and appliqué by Byelorussian artists from Australia, Europe and America in December of 1973. Nineteen artists participated: Alaksandra Ramanoŭski from Australia, Michal Saŭka-Michalski from Belgium, Ivonka Survilla from Canada, Michaś Naumovič, Uładzimier Šymaniec, and Viktar Žaŭniarovič from France, Žmitra Čajkoŭski from West Germany, and 12 artists from the USA: Barys Daniluk, Jazep Kaŭlakoŭski, Nadzia Kudasava, Ludmiła Machniuk, Piotra Miranovich, Eleonora Noryk, Irene Rahalevich, Halina Rusak, Alaksandra Stahanovič, St. Tamara, Ksenia Tumash, and Janka Juchnaviec.

The exhibition continued for two months and was attended by visitors from different parts of the USA and Canada. It was a resounding success. It stimulated the creativity of the artists, promoted interest in art on the part of the public, and received extensive coverage and favorable reaction in the Byelorussian press (2).

The year 1976 witnessed a number of art shows, the most important of which closed the year (10). This was the second group exhibition of paintings, drawings, graphics, and sculpture by Byelorussian artists from Europe and America on a large scale. The exhibit was organized in New York by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences to commemorate its 25th anniversary. 18 artists participated: from Belgium, Canada, France, and the USA, 9 men and 9 women.

Both of these group exhibits were important because they provided all Byelorussian artists—mature and young, professional and amateur,—an opportunity to participate and benefit. Among the artists, who exhibited at these shows were abstract painter Jazep Kažlakoŭski, (41) who studied art in Madrid, Spain; landscape and still-life painters: Nadzia Kudasava, Ludmiła Machniuk, (42) the poet Janka Juchnaviec, Ksenia Hryharčuk-Tumash.

The exhibitions included the works of deceased artists: Alaksandra Ramanoŭski (1922-1955), (3) Lidia Kalinoŭski-Danilovič (1910-1962), (43) and Alaksandra Stahanovič (1922-1974), (44) thus paying respect to their memory and their contributions, which continue to live.

The exhibitions included also the works of such artists as St. Tamara, Halina Rusak, and Piotra Miranovich.

With a few exceptions, like Jazep Kažlakoŭski, Irene Raha-levich, Ksenia Tumash, and, to some degree, Janka Juchnaviec—who paint abstract compositions—Byelorussian artists pursue realistic image-making. Landscapes, still life, genre paintings, and portraits are the usual subject matter of Byelorussian representational art.

While the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences has become the major factor in promoting Byelorussian fine arts in the West, many individual artists through various colleges, galleries, and cultural centers also do a remarkable job of advertising Byelorussian art. Byelorussian Community Centers in Chicago, Cleveland, Toronto, Detroit, etc., by sponsoring exhibitions, also promote Byelorussian cultural achievements.

The Byelorussian Cultural and Scientific Society in South River, New Jersey, has shown important initiative in this direction as well. Since 1974 this organization has sponsored an annual exhibition of paintings, crafts, sculptures etc. of Byelorussian artists. Their emphasis in their exhibitions is on crafts rather than on fine painting. The exhibition opens four to five weeks before Easter, and closes on Palm Sunday. The event has proved to be a

very successful enterprise with the number of participants steadily increasing each year and among them a considerable number of painters. Many of them, such as Xavery Barysavets, Aleh Machniuk, Nadzia Kudasava, Irene Rahalevich, Halina Rusak, Ksenia Tumash, Ludmila Machniuk, N. Dulski, Valentyna Shudzejka, St. Tamara and many others, exhibit there regularly. An encouraging aspect is that many young artists, second and third generation Americans, also take an active part in these exhibitions (45, 46, 47, 48).

In conclusion I would like to recall the words of the Byelorussian poet, Maksim Tank, who said that in Byelorussia there are as many poets as there are ears of corn in the corn-fields. The poets have to express themselves—some in words, some in song, some in paint, pencil, or stone. But the ears of corn need favorable conditions to grow; they need soil, moisture, and sun.

For our “poets” in the visual arts the needed soil, moisture, and sun is provided to a considerable degree by their sponsors and patrons and to a large extent this has been the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences. Thanks to this institution, Byelorussian artists have grown in number and developed the quality of their works.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. **Konadni-Vigile**, Whiteruthenian Magazine of Literature, Arts and Science, New York, 3, 4, 1955. pp. 19, 11.
2. Žuk-Hryškievič, Raisa, “Vystauka vyjauencaha mastactva”, **Biellarus**, New York, Vol. XXXIV, No. 202, 203, February and March, 1974. pp. 3, 5.
3. R.M., “Alaksandra Ramanouski (1915-1955)”, **Konadni**, New York, 4, 1955. p. 78.
4. Šymaniec, Uł., “Dva spatkaŋni z Michałam Saukam-Michalskim”, **Biellarus**, New York, Vol. XXI, No. 171, July, 1971. p. 5.
5. R. Z-H., “Vystauka abrazou Haliny Rusak”, **Biellarus**, New York, Vol. XIX, No. 152, December, 1969. p. 5.
6. Žuk-Hryškievič, Raisa, “Miensk Karavan-74 u Taroncie”, **Biellarus**, New York, Vol. XXIV, No. 208, August, 1974. p. 3.
7. Žuk-Hryškievič, Raisa, “Vystauka abrazou Ivonki Šymaniec-Survily”, **Biellarus**, New York, Vol. XXVI, No. 225, Jenuary, 1976. p. 5.
10. Žuk-Hryškievič, Raisa, “2-ja Vystauka syjaulencaha mastactva Biellaruskich mastakou zamiežza”, **Biellarus**, New York, Vol. XXVII, No. 237, 238, January, 1977. pp. 3, 3.
11. Sciablevič, Uł., “Padvojnaja uracystaść u Luvenie”, **Bačkauščyna**, München, Vol. 14, No. 50-51 (534-535), 1960. p. 7.
12. “Interviu z Michasiom Naumovičam”, **Biellarus**, New York, Vol. XXVI, No. 236, December, 1976. p. 3.
13. “U Francuzkim daviedniku”, **Biellarus**, New York, Vol. XX, No. 126, October, 1970. p. 5.

14. Fourny, Max, **Annuaire de l'Art International**, Paris, 1972-1973. p. 612.
15. Sherhadieras, Patrice, **Annuaire de l'Art International**, Paris, 1975-1976. p. 664.
16. Šymaniec, V., "Exposition a New York de la peinture biélorussienne", **La Nation Géorgienne**, Paris, No. 7(59), Octobre-Novembre, 1962. p. 4.
17. Maksimovič, R., "Na mastackich honiach", **Biélarus**, New York, Vol. XXVII, No. 241, May, 1977. pp. 3-4.
18. Uł. S., "Viktar Žauniarovič mastak z Biélaruskoj dušoj", **Bačkauščyna**, München, Vol. 14, No. 50-51(534 535), 1960. p. 5.
19. Šymaniec, Uł., "Malarskim tvorčym šlacham, hutarka z mastakom Viktaram Žauniarovičam", **Biélarus**, New York, Vol. XXVI, No. 226-227, February-March, 1976. pp. 5-6.
20. "Vystauka V. Žauniaroviča", **Byelorussian Youth**, New York, No. 16, 1962. pp. 28-29.
21. Niemanovic, Ul., "Nad sviezaj mahiľaj Piotry Syča: 18.I.1912-20.VI.1964", **Backaščyna**, Munchen, No. 7-8(621-622), July, 1964. p. 7.
22. T., "Na mahiľu niezabyunaj pamiaci Piotra Syča, **Žnič**, Rym, No. 77, 1964. pp. 4-5.
23. Tumash, Jaraslava, "Art News" **Byelorussian Youth**, New York, No. 32, 1973-74. pp. 16-17.
24. Kipel, Zora, "2-ja vystauka Biélaruskich mastakou zamiežza", **Zapisy**, No. 14, Biélaruski Instytut Navuki i Mastactva, New York, 1976. pp. 153-154.
25. Kipel, Zora, "Biélaruskija vystauki 1977 hodu", **Zapisy**, No. 15, Biélaruski Instytut Navuki i Mastactva, New York, 1977. pp. 152-157.
26. Tumash, Vitaut, "Biélaruski Instytut Navuki i Mastactva", **Zapisy**, No. 15, Biélaruski Instytut Navuki i Mastactva, New York, 1977. pp. 77-85; English summary: p. 85.
27. Siadura, Uł., "Piotra Miranovich", **Zapisy**, No. 3, Biélaruski Instytut Navuki i Mastactva, New York, 1953. pp. 44-51.
28. Maksimovič, Ryhor, "Krasa i duša rodnaj ziamli", **Biélarus**, New York, Vol. XX, No. 164, December, 1970. p. 5.
29. Maksimovič, R., "Vasilkovaja sanata", **Biélarus**, New York, Vol. XXVI, No. 206, June, 1974. p. 5.
30. Tumash, Jaraslava, "Art Review", **Byelorussian Youth**, New York, No. 33, 1974. p. 18.
31. Brown, Doris, "Franklin artist finds inspiration in heritage", **The Home News**, New Brunswick, N.J., March 24, 1974. p. 15.
32. Fenton, Monica, "Artist combines two cultures", **Franklin News Record**, Princeton, N.J., December 5, 1974. p. 12.
33. Maksimovič, R., "Krasa krajauidau malenstva", **Biélarus**, New York, Vol. XXVI, No. 236, December, 1976. p. 3.
34. "Carnegie Art Exhibits, 1968-69", Lebanon Valley College (Area Artists Series) 1969.
35. Rusak, Halina, "Krasa ziamli u krasie chvarbau", **Biélarus**, New York, Vol. XXII, No. 188, December, 1972. p. 5.

36. Žaprudnik, J., "Na wystaocy Št. Tamary", **Biėlarus**, New York, Vol. XIX, No. 141, January, 1969. p. 4.
37. "Abrazy St. Tamary Kolby", **Biėlarus**, New York, Vol. XX, No. 126, 1970. p. 5.
38. Hipp, Pat, "Basics abundant in St. Tamara's work", **Asbury Park Press**, August 20, 1975. D4.
39. Stankievič, Zina, "Paznajomimsia z mastačkaj", **Biėlarus**, New York, Vol. XXVII, No. 242, June, 1977. p. 5.
40. Hipp, Pat, "Woods enhance her art", **Asbury Park Press**, March 13, 1977. C3.
41. Tumash, Jaraslava, "Art Review", **Byelorussian Youth**, New York, No. 31, 1973, p. 14.
42. Brown, Doris, "A multi-talented couple", **The Sunday Home News**, New Brunswick, N.J., January 26, 1969. p. 28.
43. "Sv. Pam. Lidzija Danilovič", **Biėlaruskaja Dumka**, New York-South River, No. 5, 1963. p. 27.
44. V.S. "Sv. Pam. Alaksandar Stahanovič małodšy", **Biėlarus**, New York, Vol XXIV, No. 208, August, 1974. p. 5.
45. "Mastackaja vystauka", **Biėlaruskaja Dumka**, New York-South River, No. 16-17, 1973-1974. p. 45.
48. Stankievič, St., "Biėlaruskaja mastackaja vystauka u Saut Ryvery", **Biėlarus**, New York, Vol. XXVII, No. 239, March, 1977. p. 5.

ART EXHIBITIONS OF WORK BY BYELORUSSIAN ARTISTS IN THE WEST

- 1962 Viktor Žaŭniarovič** — One-man exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York.
Sept. 30 - Oct. 28, 1962, New York.
- 1964 Piotra Miranovich** — One-man exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in New York.
March 15 - April 26, 1964, New York.
- 1968 St. Tamara** — One-woman exhibition in Avanti Galleries, New York.
Dec. 10-21, 1968.
- 1969 Halina Rusak** — One-woman show sponsored by the Byelorussian Canadian Women's Association in Toronto, Canada.
Byelorussian Community Centre, 524 St. Clarens Ave., Toronto. Nov. 1969.
- 1970 Piotra Miranovich** — One-man exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, New York, during the 9th Biennial Convention of Byelorussians of North America, Sept. 1, 2, 3, 1970, New York.
- 1971 Halina Rusak** — One-woman exhibition in Georgian Court Art College Gallery. Jan. 4-31, 1971.
- 1971 Halina Rusak** — One-woman exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, New York.

- May 1-30, 1971, New York.
- 1972** **Ivonka Survilla, Piotra Miranovich, Viktor Žaŭniarovič** — three-person art show in the pavilion of the Metro Toronto Caravan, June 20 - July 1, 1972, Toronto, Canada. Sponsored by the Byelorussian Canadian Youth Association.
- 1972** **Ivonka Survilla** — One-woman exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, Canada, at the 10th Biennial Convention of Byelorussians of North America. Sept. 2, 3, 4, 1972, 524 St. Clarens Avenue, Toronto, Canada.
- 1972** **Irene Rahalevich** — One-woman exhibition sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, New York. April 30 - May 31, 1972, New York.
- 1973** **Jazep Kažlakoŭski** — Exhibited his paintings "Fugue on the theme of a Square" at the Ukrainian Arts and Library Club in New York, Oct. 1 - Nov. 4, 1973, New York.
- 1973** **Group Exhibition** — Sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences, New York, featured works by Byelorussian artists from Europe, Australia, and America. Dec 9, 1973 - Feb. 3, 1974, 401 Atlantic Avenue, New York.
- Beginning 1974:** Annual exhibit of paintings, sculpture and crafts of Byelorussian artists. Held at the Byelorussian-American Community Center, So. Whitehead Avenue, South River, New Jersey. Sponsor: Byelorussian Cultural and Scientific Society in South River, New Jersey.
- 1974** **Halina Rusak** — SOHO 20, the Feminist Art Gallery, 99 Spring St., New York presented an exhibition by Halina Rusak, Feb. 23 - March 20, 1974.
- 1974** **Group Show: Ivonka Survilla, Piotra Miranovich, Viktor Žaŭniarovič and Paŭlinka Survilla** — sponsored by the Byelorussian Canadian Youth Association in the pavilion of Metro Toronto Caravan 74, in June, 1974, Toronto, Canada.
- 1975** **Halina Rusak** — at SOHO 20, from March 15 - April 9, 1975, New York.
- 1975** **Ivonka Survilla** — Dec., 1975, in Toronto at the Byelorussian Canadian Women's Conference.
- 1976** **Group Show** — In Byelorussian-American Center, South Whitehead Avenue, South River, New Jersey.
- 1976** **Group Show — Byelorussian Artists of North America** at the Byelorussian Heritage Festival, Garden State Art Center, New Jersey, June 1, 1976.
- 1976** **Halina Rusak** — Nov. 6 - Dec. 1, 1976. SOHO 20, 99 Spring Street, New York.
- 1976** **Group Exhibition** — Nov. 28 - Dec. 31, 1976, 401 Atlantic Avenue, New York. Sponsored by the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences. Drawings, paintings and sculpture by Byelorussian artists from Europe and America.

ARTISTS FROM BYELORUSSIA: THE SCHOOL OF PARIS

by **Uładzimier Symaniec**
Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences

There is no single definition of the term **École de Paris**, or School of Paris. It has varied with the years in accordance with the writers who used it. Everybody seems to agree, however, that in the first decades of the 20th century, the name was used to describe a group of young adepts of modern art, of various styles and beliefs, who came from all over the world to live and work in Paris. A number of historians of art go further and limit the group to a score of renowned figures such as Marc Chagall, Chaim Soutine, Ossip Zadkine, Jacques Lipchitz, Modigliani, et al. all foreigners, all Jews, and all born between 1880 and 1900.¹ But what strikes us as Byelorussians is the great number of members of the School of Paris who came from Byelorussia.

In his book dedicated to Soutine, French author Raymond Cogniat attributes the revolution which took place in the arts at the turn of the century to the technological and social changes of the time. While at the end of the 19th century, fine arts were still the prerogative of the middle class, at the beginning of the 20th century we see more and more painters originating from the working class. Cogniat wonders whether Fauvism, Cubism, Expressionism, or Futurism would have been possible without the input of all those newcomers for whom the building of a new society was much more meaningful than the good taste which characterized their predecessors.

Soutine remained unaffected by the new ideas. But while the French painters of the time like Matisse, Derain, and Léger respect a certain order and are aware of artistic convention even at the peak of their rebellion, Soutine makes no effort to control his dramatic spontaneity and his improvisations. Obviously, the elements which make up his art are not the same as those which dictate the creative activities of the French painters.² According to Cogniat, the reasons for these differences are to be found in the events which took place in Central Europe at that time, and more specifically, those events which affected the creative activity of the Jewish artists. Because many writers reject the very idea of a Jewish element in art, this issue has never been given the

attention it deserves. And indeed, there was no Jewish art in the 19th century. The religious taboos to which Jews were subjected did not allow them to participate in the creative trends of the century. With the 19th century, however, things began to change. The input of the many Jewish artists who came to Paris from Central Europe and the Russian Empire (the Empire proper as opposed to Russia) at the beginning of the century is of a very special nature. They brought with them all the pathos and hopelessness of their people. Unwilling to adjust to the prevailing rules, they expressed their feelings on their canvasses by the boldness of their strokes and colors. Cogniat considers this a manifestation of the freedom they were experiencing for the first time after having been unable for so long to express themselves in their respective countries, either because of hostile regimes or because of the constraints of their own ghetto milieux.

A question many writers have asked themselves over and over again is: Why did the artists from Central Europe choose Paris? Once there, few of them studied art at the numerous art schools of the French capital, and they did not even endorse existing trends. Their only concern seemed to be to put to good use whatever they had brought with them from the old country. So why did they come?

In the case of the Jews of the Russian Empire the question should rather be: Why did they leave?

It seems that economic reasons were important, but these were perhaps not quite the ones we tend to imagine. Those who left did so not because they were extremely poor but because they were relatively well off. However, as of June 23, 1874, Jews were prohibited from moving into the Russian gubernias and the big cities of the Empire. Thus, Jewish artists could simply not obtain a higher education in the arts since all the art schools were in the big cities.

In Byelorussia there were only three secondary schools of art. The Vilnia School of Drawing was founded in 1886, its aim being to prepare commercial artists for industry. Some of its most famous students were Kikoïne, Krémégne, Mané-Katz and Soutine. The Miensk School of Drawing was founded in 1904 by Jankel Kruger. Soutine and Kikoïne also studied there. In Vitebsk, the painter Pen taught art in the school he opened in his studio in 1892. One of his most famous students was Marc Chagall. These are the three schools of art which, during the relatively prosperous pre-war period, attracted all the potential artists of the country. But while the more wealthy Christian graduates of the schools could complete their studies in the art schools of the larger cities of the Empire (Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Kiev), Jews had either to face racial discrimination in Russia or to emigrate to the West. Thus, a great number chose Paris, where they found freedom of expression and fame.

Once in Paris, they joined one of the two groups of artists then existing in the French capital: the Montmartre group, with their head office, so to speak, in an old hotel called Bateau Lavoir, and the Montparnasse group around La Ruche. Each of the groups had its own critics and trendsetters. The world-famous poet and writer Guillaume Appollinaire was the trendsetter of the Montmartre group. (He was, by the way, of Byelorussian descent and belonged to the same old family, the Kastravitzkys, as the Byelorussian poet Karus Kahaniec. He played a prominent rôle in the cultural life of the French capital and named several of the new artistic trends which developed there. The terms Surrealism and Orphism, for example, are two of his creations.

A central figure of the Montparnasse group is the Polish art dealer L. Zborowski. Besides finding a market for the group, he sent several of its members, among them Chaim Soutine, to the south of France in search of inspiration and helped them to achieve recognition.

The life of the newcomers in Paris was not an easy one. Marc Chagall recalls that all the canvasses in his studio were made out of his tablecloths, his bedlinen, and even his shirts. These artists took all kinds of jobs in order to survive. Although they had come to Paris because of the rôle the French capital played in the world of art, when they joined an art school, they did not stay there for more than two or three months. The art schools of Paris were, they realized, as conservative and academic as the ones they had known at home. They preferred to choose their own masters at the Louvre. Each of them can, in fact, be considered a school in himself, a school, however, whose roots in each case can be traced to their common origin.

Seven of the great names of the School of Paris were associated with Byelorussia.

Marc Chagall is, with Pablo Picasso, the best known of the members of the School of Paris. Born on July 7, 1887, in a suburb of Vitsebsk called Piaščanik, Marc was the son of a small grocery-store owner. The religious spirit which prevailed in his family and his love for the city of Vitsebsk are the two constant elements of his art. After studying with Pen, whose teaching he did not like, and after trying the Imperial School of Art in St. Petersburg, where his art was not appreciated, Chagall entered a private school and was offered a scholarship to go to Paris.³ There he spent four years before returning to Vitsebsk and marrying his childhood sweetheart, Bela Rosenfeld. Together with his wife, he traveled throughout the Vitsebsk area painting. After the Revolution, he became People's Commissar for Culture in Vitsebsk, and Pen's art school was turned into a public College of Arts and he became its first director. A conflict with the other revolutionaries of art such as Kasimir Malevich, however,

led him to discover the true face of the Revolution. In 1923, he decided to leave the country.

We do not intend to speak to Chagall's successful career outside Byelorussia. We all know his world-famous paintings, tapestries, and murals which decorate the Paris Opera, the Metropolitan Opera in New York, the Parliament Buildings of Israel, the walls of his own museum in Nice, France, and a number of other public buildings all over the world.

It should be stressed, however, that unlike many of his co-religionists, Chagall never forgot his homeland and his home town of Vitsebsk. In recent interviews, he clearly states that Byelorussia is the country he comes from and that Vitsebsk is as dear to his heart as Paris.

Moreover, all his work bears witness to this.

Chaim Soutine, the next member of the School of Paris from Byelorussia, is regarded by some critics as an artist of the caliber of Goya and Rembrandt.⁴

Chaim Soutine was born in 1894 in the small township of Smilavičy, 20 miles east of Miensk, the tenth son of a tailor. To the dismay of his parents and the neighborhood, he soon showed a disturbing inclination towards painting. Finding the local rabbi's face most interesting, he asked permission to paint his portrait. This was considered a deep insult by the sons of the rabbi, who beat the young boy to the point that he had to be taken to the hospital. But all's well that ends well: in order to avoid a court action, the rabbi gave the boy the substantial amount of 25 rubles, which allowed him to leave Smilavičy and register at Jankel Kruger's School of Drawing in Miensk. There he met another young enthusiast of the arts, Michel Kikoïne, and they both went to Vilnia to study at the School of Drawing and Commercial Art of that city. In order to survive, Chaim worked at a photographer's until a physician discovered his talent and sent him to Paris.

In Paris, Chaim Soutine met, among others, Marc Chagall, Ossip Zadkine, Jacque Lipschitz, and Guillaume Apollinaire. He entered l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts, which in itself indicates the high quality of the training he received in Miensk and Vilnia. He read poets and philosophers, and admired the works of Rembrandt, Courbet, Bonnard, Ensor, and some of the German Expressionists. In 1919, Zborowski, the art dealer, paid for his trip to Ceret, in Southern France, where Soutine spent three years and painted two hundred paintings. From then on, he became more and more famous until his death in 1941.

Chaim Soutine was a painter almost by "divine right". Authenticity was his main characteristic. Unaffected by the new fashions and trends in the arts, he deliberately ignored every rule and technique of painting. Instead, he poured his whole self onto the canvas. And in this sincerity and in the integrity of

his art — he would buy his own paintings to destroy them whenever he thought they were not true to him — we recognize the “young Byelorussian” whom Michel Rahon speaks about in his article dedicated to Soutine in *Jardin des Arts*, № 164-165.

While speaking of Soutine, we have mentioned the name of another member of the School of Paris from Byelorussia, **Michel Kikoïne**. Born in Rečytsa, near Homiel, in 1892, Kikoïne was fifteen years old when he first met Soutine at Kruger's School of Drawing in Miensk. One year later, they were both studying art in Vilna, and in 1911, we find Kikoïne in Paris. There, he too was admitted to l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts and moved into La Ruche, where he met the other members of the School of Paris. In 1914, he married Rosa Bunimovič, a girl from Vilnia. They had two children, one of whom, Jankel Jacques, became a painter in his own right and still lives and works in Paris.

In spite of the similarity of the paths they followed in life, Kikoïne was as calm and balanced as Soutine was violent and spontaneous. After his first exhibition in Paris in 1919, Kikoïne exhibited regularly at the Salon d'automne and spent every summer painting in his summer residence in Central France. This middle-class mentality is noticeable even in his paintings: although his strokes are as bold as Soutine's, his composition is more elaborate, and his colors more subdued and more subtle.

In October 1973, a retrospective of Kikoïne's works, including 94 paintings, was organized in Paris in the “Galerie de Paris”. It so happened that it was inaugurated less than three weeks after an exhibition of works by Soutine at the same Parisian gallery. Thus, five years after the death of Kikoïne and 32 after Soutine's, the paths of the two friends once again came very close to crossing.

Pinchus Krémégne, a native of Żaludak near Lida, was a friend of both Soutine and Kikoïne. After studying sculpture at the Vilnia School of Drawing, he left for Paris in 1912. In Paris, Krémégne joined the group of painters of Montparnasse and soon became one of the respected residents of La Ruche. In 1915, he gave up sculpture in order to dedicate himself entirely to painting.

Pinchus Krémégne is today one of the great names of contemporary painting. As a human being, however, he has lost none of the modesty and gentleness he brought with him from Byelorussia in 1912, traits which we can certainly consider part of his Byelorussian heritage.

Simon Segal, born in Bielastok in 1898, left Byelorussia in 1918 as an engineer and became a famous painter after arriving in France in 1925. His first one-man exhibition, in 1935, was a tremendous success. Shortly after, however, he entirely revised his style. He achieved his full potential in the early fifties.⁵

While speaking of the members of the School of Paris who were born in Byelorussia, we cannot omit the illustrious sculptors **Ossip Zadkine**, from Smalensk, and **Jacque Lipschitz**, from Druzhieniki. They both arrived in Paris in 1909, and had the honor of being the first artists to adapt Cubism to sculpture. We all know of Lipchitz, since he has spent many years of his life in the United States and has been widely publicized. As for Zadkine, who, in the School of Paris, distinguished himself by the human and poetic dimensions of his art, he is today considered the greatest sculptor Central and Eastern Europe ever produced. In his autobiography **Le maillet et le ciseau**, published in Paris in 1968, he affectionately and nostalgically narrates his childhood in Smalensk and Vitsebsk.

These considerations and facts enable us to say that it was Byelorussia that produced Chagall, Krémégne, Soutine, Kikoïne, Segal, Zadkine, and Lipchitz, who were the founding members of the School of Paris and who made such an essential contribution to the world treasury of art. They were born, brought up, and even trained in Byelorussia. This training was not given to them in famous art schools, of course, because the Byelorussia people were then experiencing one of the darkest periods of national destitution in their history and were deprived of any kind of higher educational institutions. Byelorussia did, however, give them everything she was able to offer under these conditions.

If any nations can lay claim to them, these nations are Byelorussia and France. From Byelorussia they brought with them the substance of their art. And France gave them the environment which enabled them to achieve fame and recognition. The assertion by some writers that these artists are Russian has no foundation whatsoever.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ¹ **Dictionnaire de la peinture moderne**. Paris, F. Hazan, 1954, p. 217.
- ² Raymond Cogniat. **Soutine**. Paris, Flammarion, 1973; New York, Crown, 1973.
- ³ Marc Chagall. **Ma vie**. Paris, Stock, 1957. **My Life**. New York, Orion, 1960.
- ⁴ Józef Czapski. "Derwisch" (In the Collection **Oko**. Paris, 1959).
- ⁵ **Dictionnaire de l'art contemporain**. Paris, Larousse, 1965.

MODERN BYELORUSSIAN ART

Halina Rusak

Douglass College

Rutgers — The State University of New Jersey

Art in Byelorussia since the Second World War has produced in the area of painting alone, a great number of artists. The dictionary entitled **Khudozhniki Sovietskoy Belorussii** (Artists of Soviet Byelorussia, Minsk, 1976), attests to the numbers. The subject of this article, however, is not the quantity, but the quality of post-war art in Byelorussia. What has been created in the post-war years in terms of originality, universality, and permanence? In voicing an opinion on this subject one cannot avoid taking into account the stifling conditions under which these artists have had to create.

Art in the Soviet Union was and is encouraged to follow three directives: "**partijnost'**, **idejnost'**, **i narodnost'**," (the party line, the ideals of socialist-realism, and the national character). It was Lenin who put great stress on the popular character in order to make art accessible to the masses.¹ In the choice of subject matter the artist was obliged to depict the leaders of the Party; to praise the Communist endeavors of industrialization and collectivization; and to represent the heroic deeds either of a strong, unconquerable, devoted, happy, well-adjusted, single-minded worker of the new class of the proletariat; or of a soldier in the Red Army — ready to fight and die for the Party cause. The style had to be simple, straightforward, and without any ambiguities.

To carry out these directives, the Decree of 1932 (**On the Reconstruction of Literary and Artistic Organizations**) abolished all independent art groups and replaced them with state unions, providing built-in Party mentors. The Party also had the press under its supervision; it dispensed commissions and loans; it engineered purchases and exhibits. In 1934 another decree followed, outlining the formula for Socialist Realism. In 1939 the all-embracing Artists Union was organized.²

In spite of such narrowly-prescribed restrictions on creativity, art in the Soviet Union has made significant strides towards widening its scope since the early 1950's. Krushchev adopted a policy of Party non-interference. This policy of non-inter-

ference was continued until the Manège Affair. On November 29, 1962 a large retrospective exhibition was opened at the Manège Gallery in Moscow. It included a great deal of modern and abstract art. Some of the works were offensive to Krushchev. On December 17, 1962 the Party declared that it was reassessing the liberalization policy on the arts.³ Art has never returned, however, to the previous type of alignment. There still linger critics who view art with the eyes of the 1930s and 1940s (e.g., P. V. Maslenikaŭ),⁴ but overall conditions have improved. Each artist still tries to dedicate some portion of his or her artistic output to socialist-realistic themes: war heroism, Party leaders, the glory of collectives, and the like. However, many artists explore, as well, the universal themes of human suffering, the psychological effects of urbanization or of collectivization, allegory and myth, and history that goes beyond the unvanquished hero. Many artists have achieved a level of performance that should assure them recognition on the pages of Byelorussian art history and of world criticism.

A large segment of artistic output is in the area of landscape painting. Two obvious reasons for this popularity are the genuine love of the artists for their country and the endless variety of shape and color which it offers. A less obvious reason may be the fact that this category of art allows the artist to be completely non-committal toward any imposed ideology without fear of retribution.

In the field of landscape painting the style that has persisted since the early 1920's has been soft Impressionism, not, by any means, a true Impressionism. It had no scientific basis in color application comparable to that of the French Impressionists. Nor did it study the effect of light on different objects at different times of day. Using a liberated brushstroke, these artists did not strive after accurate detail, but after an individualistic expression of the mood of the moment. More properly it should be called a form of Expressionism. In this vein were executed paintings of the countryside by artists who began their careers before the Second World War. Mikoła Dučyc, Uladzimir Kudrevič and Vitaŭt Białyński-Birula enjoyed painting Byelorussian forests in soft, subdued colors.

The impressionistic stamp is still felt in Byelorussia. At mid-century such artists as Halina Azhur, A. Huhel and Abram Krol continue to use an impressionistic brushstroke. Halina Azhur likes to open her landscape on far distant stretches of the country. Azhur's landscape is very typical of Central Byelorussian, north of the capital, Minsk — "Łahojsk Hills" (1957), "The End of March" (1957). Birch predominates, as well as hilly terrain with a stretch of road that leads the traveller's eye to wide vistas and to distant woods and meadows.

In his painting "Windy Day" (1956) A. Huhel conveys convincingly the feeling of the wind roaming through grass, trees, and skies. One can almost feel oneself drowning in the tall sway of grasses, an escape blocked by the feathery branches of the trees.

Abram Krol in his painting "Landscape" (1956) achieves an almost watercolor effect. The spring landscape is very delicate in feeling. It gives a sensation of soft melting snow, of an approaching spring. Winter is Krol's favored season. He has several successful canvases dedicated to this time of year: "Byelorussian Landscape," "Byelorussian Motif," "Winter near Minsk."

An artist who deciphered and approximated most closely the style of the French Impressionist Monet was Dzimitry Alejnik. He applied this style, however, in his own inventive way. Alejnik's originality lies in his use of oblique perspective. It is not completely aerial, but most of his paintings are opening vistas from a high vantage point: whether that is a backyard, a shipyard, or a forest. He also has a good sense of color. His work is light and joyous; reds, oranges, yellows, and white predominate. Alejnik's "River Port in Spring" (1963) is the best example of his successful beginning with French Impressionism. The boats are still moored by ice patches, but the trees have a suggestion of yellowish green on them — the sign of approaching spring.

The painting "Orchards in Bloom" introduces a kind of white writing to his technique. It adds a feeling of lightness to the spring mood. In his painting "Spring Motif" we find the soft colors of the forests coming to life, engaging our attention and letting us roam happily through the receding tree-tops of the forest.

His work "Indian Summer" (1967) shows a happy relaxed mood of the country on a holiday. A village is in the far background. A birch grove runs almost the entire height of the picture. The trees are somewhat stylized touches of yellow with a sprinkle of deep orange. The people are also tiny dabs of color. The established pattern is spacious and happy.

During the 1940s a new name came to public attention, that of Vitali Cvirka, who has held the leading role in Byelorussian art for the several decades since. Cvirka was born in the county of Homel in a teacher's family. He was exposed to painting at an early age, since his father's hobby was painting. A close friend of the family was a well-known Byelorussian writer of satire, Kandrak Krapiva. He encouraged Cvirka's interest in the arts.⁵ Thence came his love of Byelorussian themes. Cvirka studied in Homel, Minsk, Vitsebsk, and Moscow. In 1941 he came home to Minsk, where he settled permanently and became a teacher of art at the Byelorussian Theater-Art Institute. Cvirka was mainly a landscape painter, and in the beginning he painted in the post-Impressionist

brush stroke reminiscent of Van Gogh, and, sometimes, more of Pissarro. The art critic Marina Orlova marvels at the epic proportions in his art, and at the peculiarly Byelorussian character of his landscapes.

"In Cvirka's landscapes there is always concealed a feeling of the immediate nearness to nature, specifically to the nature of Byelorussia with its gentle hills, wooded areas, the richness of its clouds, and the warmth of its winds."⁶

Over the years Cvirka's style changed, developing into something innovative and unique in Byelorussian art. His work acquired the quality of a wood inlay; at times very stern in its simplicity of line and color. The outlines are crisp. The shading is maintained within the individual areas. It echoes the folk tradition in wood. We will meet other artists working within the same style. While the styles of the 1950's still carry the imprint of European and Parisian influence, the styles of the 1960's show originality, individualism, and independence. The general trend is toward a sharp, distinct, but stylized outline.

Thematically Byelorussian rivers and lakes provide magic inspiration for Vitali Cvirka. He records in his landscapes many typical fishing villages and fishing huts of Lake Narač. He immortalizes in his works the major and minor rivers of the country: the Prypiač. (1963), the Biarezina (1967), the Nioman (1968), and the Hanča (1969).

In this endeavor he is preceded by V. Kudrevič, who paints the Džvina, the Sož, the Dniapro, and the Svistač. The Nioman river has been immortalized by another artist, Stanislaŭ Žukoŭski, who has spent most of his life abroad, but who has constantly returned for inspiration to his native Hrodzienščyna.

Vitali Cvirka also depicts Byelorussian villages nestling comfortably against the elevated banks of rivers, e.g., "Tale of Paleśse" (1965), and the adjacent countryside after harvest time — "Harvesting is Finished".

Another artist who paints in a similar "wood inlay" style is Piatro Danielija, an artist from Bieraście. Bieraście, the most Western city in Byelorussia, is developing into an active artistic center. Danielija outlines his areas in distinct blotches of color filled with detail. In his paintings "Autumn Reverberation" (1956) and "Colors of September" he conveys the mood of a sun-and-shadow autumn day from the vantage point of a white-washed village cresting a sun-drenched hilltop.

Even more crisp is his country road "Over the Hills" (1968), progressing and carrying shadows over the dips in the road, past the rocky outcrops, bordering trees, and distant houses. Danielija depicts his Bieraście region in an interesting original style. He

also paints cityscapes. In his work "Day" his stern treatment reminds one of the American artist, Edward Hopper. Both paint empty streets with an occasional human figure.

Maj Danzih is definitely an artist of urban and industrial landscapes and his colors are somber. Chagall was enamored with Vitsebsk and Danzih is enamored with Minsk. "My City — Minsk" (1967) shows a progressive dynamic quality of the modern city: the curving sweep of the modern highway, the trains, the factories. Poster art embellishes the sidewalk and adds a touch of color. Through an opening in the city skyline one can see the steeples of distant churches. The time is winter: the frozen river, the snowclad ground, and trees add a crisp effect.

"My Ancient and Young City" juxtaposes, as the title indicates, the two aspects of Minsk: old churches and buildings contrasted with the construction and production of modern Minsk. His "Busy Day at the Salihorsk Mines" (1960) shows a typical industrial setting on a wet day. The colors are modified; blues and greens with touches of yellow. Water stands in the furrows. The entire effect is one of dreariness.

Portrait painting is at the present time a rather popular subject in Byelorussia, ranging from milkmaid heroines to nurses, agronomists, politicians, and tool makers.

Among the modern artists Uladzimir Stelmašonak attracts particular attention. In his portrait of the Byelorussian writer, Jakub Kołas (1966-67), Stelmašonak uses that unique technique reminiscent of woodwork. It is a very strong rendition of the Byelorussian writer. Kołas was a writer who understood and wrote about life in the country. He is represented here as a man of the country: attired in peasant costume, with a hat worn in the peasant style, and a halo in wood, paying tribute to his folk origin. The painting is almost monochromatic, but variation in texture adds richness and interest. In his painting of an academician, Stelmašonak draws our attention through the strong contrast in color to the face of his subject. The stark whiteness of the shirt directs our vision to the firm, uncompromising line of the academician's mouth, and to the sensitive, deeply-set eyes.

I. Baroŭski paints a series of occupational figures. An example is his painting of a tool maker. In addition to the strong outline of a face in shadow, one sees a tool maker's hands, poised for action. The hands themselves look like a tool. The unity of hands and tool conveys unmistakably the message of a skill.

Viktar Sachnienka gives us a portrait of one of the most important artists of present-day Byelorussia, Michaś Savicki. The artist's figure is almost absorbed by the background canvas. The focus is on the artist's sensitive and vigorous face and his long, eager, creative fingers.

Many modern portraitists use the device of focusing the viewer's attention on that part of a person's body which in the artist's opinion is most expressive of their subject's interest or occupation. Haŭryła Vaščanka, in his painting of a young boy, "Kościk" (1972), focuses our attention on his eager eyes, leaving the rest of his face in shadow. One can appreciate a child's unsatiable curiosity in the exploration of his world.

Among women artists, Ninel Ščasnaŭa has developed an interesting style akin to pointillism of Seurat. In her portrait called "Spring" the generalized face of a girl barely projects from the soft pointillistic background. It is just an expression, light and enchanting. She uses the same approach in painting her own portrait. She has also done a portrait of the major contemporary Byelorussian writer, Ivan Mielež (1970).

Still life receives comparatively little attention in contemporary Byelorussian art. One very talented still-life artist who must, however, be mentioned is Velaryja Žoŭtak. Žoŭtak's flowers are very fresh and lively. In her painting "Forest Bells—Still Life" (1958) she paints an open window from outside rather than from inside. The detail on the window sill is very characteristic of house architecture. The open shutters frame the flower vase, but do not constrict it. The cross-bars of the windows lead the eye in and out, and the feathery green of the flowers projects out of the room. The flowers are delicate and fresh. A homespun linen cloth hung from the window sill adds an interesting detail. Among her other still-life paintings Žoŭtak has dedicated several to red mountain ash. In general, Žoŭtak knows how to express a complicated still life motif most successfully. Žoŭtak is also a good genre artist. She delights in children as a subject. She paints school children with warmth and understanding. In her work "Winter came" children are getting ready for skating. We see a typical house interior. An older sister is putting her skates on, while a friend and her younger brother are looking on. All three are wearing warm winter outfits. A sheer curtain across the window provides a backdrop. A houseplant adds a decorative touch, while a footstool in the center serves as a focusing device. In another painting entitled "Two Friends" one can fully identify with these two warmly-clad girls who, on their way from school, have sat down on a bench to stretch out their legs and take in the freshness of a winter day. In yet another scene one can observe a long file of youngsters crossing the bridge to school. The figures are tiny, yet one knows that they are the main interest of the artist. Žoŭtak captures admirably a mood of childhood unconcern.

Representation of the toil, worries, and joys of the older generation runs the gamut from potato pickers to construction workers, and engages a large number of artists.

Artist Vitali Cvirka registers on canvas the miller's occupation. The mill used to be the center for community gathering

at harvest time. In his painting "At the Mill" (1954) Cvirka depicts a row of carriages in the mill's courtyard awaiting the produce that is to be taken home. M. V. Dyčyc paints the same theme in 1955.

Another important occupation that brings people together is summer work in the fields. In his painting "In Byelarus" (1967) Cvirka shows a young, animated group returning from the day's work. One of the women is apparently carrying a surveying instrument. Another is pushing a bicycle. The instrument and bicycle indicate modern times. A typically Cvirka landscape can be seen in the background.

An artist who includes in his repertoire the season of haying is Anton Barchatkaŭ. His idyllic rendition of "Noon at the Hay-site" (1962) is reminiscent of Manet's "Le Déjeuner sur l'Herbe", except that everyone is decorously clothed.

One of the most prolific and talented artists of today is Michaś Savicki, a survivor of Buchenwald and Dachau. L. Drobaŭ in his *Art of Soviet Byelorussia* says of Savicki's work:

"Simple in composition, rich in color-scheme, they depict characteristic aspects of the Byelorussian people's life. M. Savicki's paintings appeal by their depth of feeling and distinctive national touch."⁷

One can trace the progress of Savicki's development from the 1950s through the 1970s. He started, as did most of his colleagues, with an impressionistic brushstroke and texture. His thesis work, "The Song" (1957), maintains an impressionistic stamp. A group of young village women is returning home with a song after a day of haying. The painting is long and horizontal, but the main group is skillfully framed by the diagonals of the roof rafters. The woman looking up at the group from the river's edge directs one's attention to the singing group.

Savicki is developing a very strong individualistic style and a wide range of subject matter. It is a pity that he often wastes his talent on propaganda which may last as a piece of historic documentation, but surely will not be taken for genuine art. Savicki understands and expresses his idea of the universality of art in his article, "In Search of Artistic Imagery", but he does not always practice what he preaches. Savicki writes:

"For me it is very important to paint not the way one sees, but the way one knows . . .

One wanted to show people at war; not individual events and situations, but a man of passions; the beauty of a human being and the strength of his spirit . . . Only then can it sound as a current, as a picture from life today."⁸

Savicki's work "In the Field" (1972) exhibits a less active, more

reflective mood. In a group of workers standing in a relaxed pose at breaktime Savicki explores the psychology of different types of people. A general view of the rye fields serves simply as a backdrop.

Among other artists, Michaś Daŭhiallo successfully depicts "Potato Planting" (1970) seen from a distant perspective. Michaś Siaŭruk paints his figures at closer range and more realistically than some of his cohorts. In both of his works, "Girls" (1968), representing a group of rakers, and "The New House" (1967), representing people on a break at a construction site, the artist's characters are people of flesh and muscle. Both groups are relaxed and convincing.

Haŭryła Vaščanka in his painting "August" presents us with the bounty of an apple orchard through the satisfied expression of a woman's face savoring an apple. She is placed in the foreground of the painting, while the gathered apples furnish the background.

The theme of collectivization interests the artist Piatro Krochalaŭ. It is not, however, the idyllic side of collectivization that interests him. He presents a psychological study of human reactions toward the new process of collectivization. In his painting "The Organization of Collective Farms in 1929" one sees a group of farmers, men and women, gathered together to listen to a Party official about the advantages which the collective life will bring to them. The farmers are not at all sure that this is what they want. Of the two front figures one is scratching his neck in evident anxiety; another one, grim with resignation, is looking at the floor. In the center an argument is going on. In the background somebody is raising a question. A woman looks stunned. Each face presents a striking study of individual reactions to a sweeping reorganization that will affect their lives. Krochalaŭ returned to the same theme in 1965-67 in his painting "Collectivization". Here we find an atmosphere similar to the preceding one. A man is saying goodbye to his horse. One woman is openly crying. This time there are even a few soldiers to help with collectivization.

City dwellers usually receive much less attention from Byelorussian artists than do country folk. An effective rendition of city life is presented in the work of Monos Monoscon, named "Morning". People are leaving for work. A group is waiting for a trolleybus. One can feel the chill of dawn in the winter, the penetrating frost touching faces, and the welcome lights of an approaching streetcar in the distance.

In his piece "Chatter" Michaś Savicki paints a group of young working women in the city. Apparently they are at work on construction. One can see an unfinished house in the background, and in their hands the women hold construction tools. It is cold. The diagonals in the windblown kerchief, skirt, and the branches of the trees add vitality to the scene. Predominant blues emphasize

the chill of the weather. The artistic milieu of the city is, in the last analysis, touched upon by only a few artists.

A. Krol and H. Liūšyc take the viewer to the Byelorussian literary milieu. Both include the writer Kupala in their works. Abram Krol goes back to the year 1913 when writers Ciotka and Kupala represented the leading spirit of the country. It is a room interior where a group of writers are discussing an urgent problem. H. Liūšyc also presents the writers Kupala and Čorny at a time of worry and concern in his painting "Janka Kupala and Kuźma Čorny at Piečyščy" (1963).

A woman artist, Raisa Kudrevič, in her work "Before the Concert" (1967) catches the hectic mood of preparation and anticipation by the performers.

Another major theme that prevails in Byelorussian art is the subject of tragedy and the hardships of war. Every major war in Europe has been fought on Byelorussian territory: the Napoleonic marches, World War I, and World War II, not to mention such local conflicts as the Kalinoŭski Uprising of 1863 against the oppression of Tsarist Russia. Many major artists, therefore, document the theme of war and explore the psychology of armed conflict.

A. Huhel and Raisa Kudrevič have, in a joint effort, produced a dramatic picture of Kastuś Kalinoŭski, the leader of the 1863 Uprising, addressing a group of farmers at a Sunday fair. A church in the background indicates that it is a Sunday gathering. The diagonals in Kalinoŭski's and his listeners' postures introduce a dynamic quality. National costumes imply that this is a gathering in the national cause. A little boy, looking around in concern, introduces an element of warning. His gesture suggests that someone is approaching, someone not necessarily desirable, and denotes that this is an underground movement, unsanctioned by the government.

In 1956 Vitali Cvirka went to the region of Lake Narač to study the country and the people for his canvas "The Rebellion of Fishermen on Lake Narač". It told the story of the rebellion of Byelorussian fishermen against the Polish government's revocation of their fishing rights.⁹ Cvirka showed the defiance of the group by the attitude of the central figure—a man in a red shirt. His clenched fist and the bent bodies of the supporting figures convey tension. The diagonals of criss-crossing boat masts and the red shirt further underline the central figure of the leader. Soldiers occupy little space in the composition. Only one complete figure, that of an officer, is shown in the distance. The presence of the others is felt by their slanted rifles in the left hand corner, and by the partial figure of a soldier. The chief role is played by the rebels. They are the heroes in an uneven struggle for their rights.

Cvirka's sketches for his group paintings are often better

than the finished work. They show spontaneity in handling, and an absence of contrivance which are not always apparent in his finished works.

In his work "The Unvanquished" Cvirka deals with a tragic everyday occurrence during World War II—an execution. He documents a man bravely facing his executioners. We do not see much of the hero's face. It is his nonchalant pose, his raised chin in profile, and his magnificent shoulders that demonstrate the man's defiance of both the Germans and Death.

Another painful but frequent occurrence in Byelorussian life is relocation and parting—the result of wars and economic hardships. This theme is widely represented in the work of Byelorussian artists, going back to the pre-revolutionary works of Ferdinand Ruščyc and Stanislaŭ Bohuš-Siestrancevič in their paintings "Ėmigrés" and "On the Road," respectively.

A. S. Huhel in his work "From the Past" paints (1957) a relocation scene under convoy by armed soldiers. A young woman, in this instance, is being deported against her will to an unknown location.

Krochalaŭ is an interesting and revealing artist. His war painting "Past Marches" (1958) presents a psychological comment on the character of forced marches. As the title indicates, it is not any one particular march. It is a comment on displaced people of all times. These are people on the move; leaving homes not because they want to, but because they have to; old and young alike moving, in the middle of winter, into the unknown.

In his painting "Guerilla Fighters" (1963) Savicki makes his statement on the theme of parting. The white and blue set the mood of cold and sadness. A man's face, the column of a woman's back, her kerchiefed head, and her bony hand on the man's shoulder are more expressive of grief than tears being shed. The figures of departing men are not limited by the canvas. They are marching beyond our line of vision.

Savicki treats the subject of relocation in another painting, called "Vitebsk Gate" (1966-67). This time one sees a solid column of women, some with small babies in their arms; a single horse-and-buggy almost completely obliterated by a group, moving on, under the burden of heavy bundles, in determined solidarity. The faces of women arrest the viewer's attention: there is nothing soft about them; they are stern, strong, and unrelenting.

A permanent form of parting—death—is analyzed by an interesting artist from Smalensk, Viktor Hramyka. He establishes his theme with a minimum of line and color. In his work "On the Prypiać" the man is dead or dying. In his two figures of women the artist explores the human psychology in the face of death. One immediately perceives two different reactions. The passive columnar form of an old woman, hands folded in her lap, registers knowledge and acceptance. The horizontal line of the man's

body emphasizes the static effect of resignation. The young woman, however, does not want to surrender her hope. She is mutinous, calling for help. Her raised hands, the line of her dress, the line of her hair—all proclaim that she will not accept the finality of the situation. The supporting curve of the coastline underlines her restlessness and agitation. The sparsity of color adds to the solemnity of the moment. The painting is symbolic of old acceptance and young rebellion. As such, it is a very strong representation. "Wood inlay" is the technique used in this work.

**
*

Let us now turn to works that go beyond a strictly narrative content and enter the area of beliefs and symbolic implications.

Viktar Hramyka's landscape "Flax Fields of Byelorussia" (1969) elevates the flax to the position of a symbol. Next to bread this fiber is the wealth and pride of Byelorussia. When it blooms it makes the country look like a vast blue expanse that moves and breathes. In this painting the viewer does not recognize the plant called "flax". S/he simply takes in the beauty of the blue expanse stretching before our eyes. A happy feeling is generated by the addition of yellow color in the foreground. The transition from yellow to pinkish purple and black in the distance is very effective, but it introduces an ominous note. The waning sun adds to the feeling of foreboding and anxiety.

The artist, Chviedar Žuraŭkoŭ, has done a painting dedicated to "Flax" (1967), where in a sense, it becomes almost an ikon. One sees a group of women admiring a beautiful finished piece of linen. The mood is virtually that of worship. The stylized technique employed is quite appropriate.

The produce of the Byelorussian land is also celebrated by Michaś Savicki. He introduces the symbolism of bread in his paintings entitled "Bread" (1962) and "Breads" (1968?). Bread is a symbol of the good life, Savicki sanctifies this reverence for bread in his paintings, especially the one done in 1968 called "Breads". Three figures of women are walking in a solemn procession, carrying bread. One can feel the enormous importance of this event. The trees and the figures of the women are stylized, but the faces are severely realistic. The last figure contacts us with her eyes and holds our attention. The work conveys a deep symbolic message—a firm intent to hold on to one's own heritage, to the riches of its material and spiritual values.

As has been done by many artists in many lands, Savicki has given Byelorussia her own Madonna and Child (1967). Very appropriately she is a country Madonna, a Madonna in the midst of war. And because of all this, she is strong and sturdy—in figure and in face. The women in the background are working the ravaged land. The soldiers guard the Madonna's uneasy peace. The grasp of the misery of the situation is depicted in the lined and

furrowed face and the lowered eyes of the women in attendance. To paint his Madonna Savicki uses not the conventional color blue, but the national colors red and black. Savicki is an artist very strong at characterization. He has done for Byelorussian art what Orozco did for Mexican. He has perceptively and sensitively established a type of Byelorussian woman, psychologically and symbolically.

Haŭryła Vaščanka, from the Homel region of Paleśsie, has produced some very interesting work to date. In several of his works he has immortalized the white stork of Byelorussia. People of Byelorussia have a strong, sentimental feeling for this large bird. It is believed that its presence on one's property brings good fortune. The stork is protected, and is a common sight in the country. In his painting "My Paleśsie" Vaščanka shows the large vistas of the country; a group of his country-folk in the foreground, and above the symbolic spread of storks' wings in flight, an omen of good fortune.

In some of his work Vaščanka expands his vision beyond his country, taking in the whole universe. In his work "Dreams" he superimposes the symbolic birds of Byelorussia against the world of the outer planets. The stretched figure underneath, holding an open book, looks up at the planet and the birds in flight, reaching in his dreams for the universe.

This short survey of the second half of 20th century art in Byelorussia is merely suggestive of the breadth of subject and style extant. The range of subject matter includes landscape, portrait, country and city life, collectivization, war scenes, relocation, and symbolism. Stylistically painting varies from impressionism to pointillism and realism but also includes some very individual styles that have not yet been categorized. A style that seems to be unique to Byelorussian art is the one that suggests wood incrustation.

This survey is based on sources available to the author. In many cases these did not include a complete range of an artist's work; some artists have been omitted who deserve consideration. This omission is due to the lack of accessible information. Black-and-white reproductions in the dictionary entitled *Artists of Soviet Byelorussia* are helpful, but of too poor quality to be able to render an accurate record of artistic achievement. The Soviet periodical *Byelarus'* includes in each issue several color reproductions of contemporary artists' work. It would be helpful, however, to have available along with these reproductions a short biographical note on the artist and the date of the work represented. Within the last few years several pictorial monographs have appeared in print, giving an idea of contemporary artistic activity in Byelorussia. Unfortunately, the text accompanying these monographs is very skimpy. On the positive side is the fact that this material is presented in several languages.

The author would have liked to accompany this text with reproductions of artists' work. However, that has not proved possible within the scope of such a short article. It will have to await a longer treatment in the future.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Paul Sjeklocha and Igor Mead, **Unofficial Art in the Soviet Union** (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), p. 31.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 91, 100.

⁴ P. V. Maslenikau, **Z historyji stanauleńnia sacyjalistyčnaha realizmu u biełaruskim tematycznym žyvapisie: Vyjaulenčaje mastactva Biełarusi**. Vol 1 (Minsk: Biełaruś, 1977), pp. 26-39.

⁵ Olga V. Zaslavskaja, **Vitalij Konstantinovich Cvirko** (Moscow: Sovetskij Khudozhnik, 1960), p. 5.

⁶ Marina A. Orlova, **Iskusstvo Sovetskoi Byelorussii** (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii Khudozhnikov SSSR, 1960), p. 209.

⁷ Leanid N. Drobau, **Mastactva Biełaruskaj SSR** (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1972), p. 26.

⁸ M. A. Savicki, **U pošukach mastackich vobrazau. Vyjaulenčaje mastactva Biełarusi**. Vol. 1 (Minsk: Biełaruś, 1977), pp. 88-89.

⁹ O. Zaslavskaja, **Cvirko**, op. cit., p 44.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Biełaruś, Minsk, 1972-

Biełaruski saviecki žyvapis. Minsk: Biełaruś, 1978.

Drobau, Leanid N. **Mastactva Biełaruskaj SSR**. Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1972.

Herasimovich Piotr M. and Nikiforov, Piotr P. **Izobrazitelnoe Iskusstvo Belorusskoj SSR**. Moscow: Sovetskij Khudozhnik, 1957.

Kacar, M. S. **Narysy pa historyji vyjaulenčaha mastactva Saveckaj Biełarusi**. Minsk: Dziaržaunaje Vydaviectva BSSR, 1960.

Khudozhniki Sovetskoi Belorussii. Minsk: Izdatelstvo Byelaruś, 1976.

Maslenikau, P. V. **Biełaruski saviecki tematyczny žyvapis**. Minsk: Vydaviectva Akademii navuk BSSR, 1962.

Orlova, Marina A. **Iskusstvo Sovetskoi Belorussii**. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii Khudozhnikov SSSR, 1960.

Sabalenka, T., ed. **Biełaruski žyvapis**. Minsk: Dziaržaunaje vydaviectva BSSR, 1961.

Šaura, H. F. **Hauryiŭ Charytonavič Vaščanka**. Minsk: Biełaruś, 1978.

Sjeklocha, Paul and Mead, Igor. **Unofficial Art in the Soviet Union**. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Vyjaulenčaje mastactva Biełarusi. Minsk: Biełaruś, v. 1-, 1977 —.

Zaslavskaja, Olga V. **Vitalij Konstantinovich Cvirko**. Moscow: Sovetskij Khudozhnik, 1960.

BYELORUSSIAN MUSIC IN THE UNITED STATES

by Dimitri Weresow
Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences

Although the Byelorussian community in the United States of America is not as large as those of some other Slavic groups, the contributions of Byelorussians to the development of their native music are quite significant and, by comparison, in some areas even surpass those of some of the other groups. The Byelorussian community has been fortunate in possessing the three necessary elements for the natural development of musical culture, viz., **composers** who identify and develop typical national elements, incorporating them into their musical creations; and **directors** and **performers** by whom the creations of the composers are brought to the public.

Beginning with such founders of Byelorussian musical composition in the United States as Professor Mikola Kulikovich and Byelorussian People's Artist Viachaslaŭ Selakh-Kachanski — as well as Professor Mikola Ravienski whose music became an integral part of Byelorussian cultural development in this country although he himself never lived here — a solid musical tradition was begun, became well established, and has continued for these twenty-five years.

This enviable tradition of musical composition has been continued by a group of composers which includes Elza Zubkovich, Ksavery Barysaviec, Kastuś Kisly, and Dimitri Weresow, as well as Alex Karpovich, whose writings have become a significant part of the fabric of Byelorussian musical culture although he did not come to America.

The founders of Byelorussian musical performance and theater were former artists and singers in Byelorussian theaters and opera houses in Minsk: Lidia Januškievich-Nedwiga, Barbara Vierzhbalovich, Nadzieja Grade-Kulikovich, and Natalla Kulikovič-Chemiarysaŭ.

Their example has been followed and maintained by Liza Markoŭskaja, Klava Jarashevich, Halina Orsa, Ala Romano, Luda Makhniuk, Renia Kaciuk, Vera Ramuk, Mikola Streczyn, Pola Brezhneva, Irene Kalada-Smirnov, Piotra Koniuch, Stefan Vicik;

and in the younger generation by Bahdan Andrusyshyn. The fine tradition of folk-song performance has found competent exponents in Hela Pietysh, Kacia Dashkievich, Kacia Jackievich, Olha Lukashevich, Tatiana Kananchuk, and a number of other talented individuals.

Initiated by Professor Mikola Kulikovich and Director Viačaslaŭ Selach-Kachanski, the teaching of Byelorussian music and choreography has been taken up and continued by Dimitri Weresow, Ksavery Barysaviec, Kastuś Kisly, Elza Zubkovich, Uładzimir Litvinka, and Elizabeth Shak. Among its accomplished pianists the Byelorussian community numbers such performers as Dzimitry Bychkoŭski, and Margaryta Rudak.

Byelorussians in America have produced a remarkable number of choirs and ensembles. While a few of them were short-lived, others have lasted many years and are still active today. In the early fifties most of these groups were mixed choirs, although such well-known ensembles (to audiences in both America and Canada) as **Zhalejka** came into being. Under the leadership of its founder and director, Ksavery Barysaviec, the ensemble **Kalina** came into being in the early sixties in South River, New Jersey; the self-conducted sextet **Homan** emerged in New York; and the ensemble **Vasilki**, conducted by Kastuś Kalosha developed a fine reputation in Cleveland. These choirs and ensembles of varying sizes have entertained audiences throughout the country on numerous occasions, contributing in important fashion to the propagation of Byelorussian musical culture in the United States.

The richness of this culture has been particularly evident in the quality of performances which have become a tradition at the Garden State Arts Center Festival each year. These annual events, called "days of Byelorussian culture" by the press, with good reason, have earned the affection and support of the Byelorussian community in North America and are now a firmly-established part of the community's normal rhythm of self-expression each summer.

This overview of accomplishments to date should not lead us to conclude that everything worthwhile has been done and that there is no more work to do. It is the composers' task to improve their compositions both technically and thematically. Byelorussian composers in the United States have been able to demonstrate and develop typical national features in lyrical and popular compositions. However, we have not succeeded in finding and including typically Byelorussian characteristics in patriotic and heroic songs. Instead, regrettably, we have permitted non-Byelorussian music to influence our work in this area. In his important work, **Byelorussian Soviet Opera**, Professor M. Kulikovich remarks in discussing the heroic style among Byelorussian composers: "We cannot forget that not every composer is capable of developing and expressing the heroic style; for Byelorussian

composers who grew up and matured in the atmosphere of lyrical folklore illustrative of Byelorussian nature, the heroic theme is not a natural or instinctive part of his creative expression." (p. 32). It is simply a fact that the heroic theme, when it occurs, is rather bland and uninspiring.

Desirable trends which Byelorussian patriotic music should follow in its further development include the use of such forms as cantata, oratorio, and opera — now at an early stage of development among us — and the use of major historical themes such as Kastuś Kalinoŭski (which has, of course, been employed by Shchagloŭ and Lukas in their work, but are not heard in our Byelorussian homeland); the Slutsak Uprising, patriotic themes from World War II, the literary works of Byelorussian writers, and the use not only of rhyming works which can be adapted musically, but non-rhyming pieces as well.

An important item in our national life and one which demands serious study and application in the future is music for the Byelorussian national anthem. Although Byelorussians have developed and used several national anthems in the past, including the presently widely-accepted "My vyjdziam ščylnymi radamy," (with music by Uladzimir Teraŭski and words by Makar Krautsoŭ), authentic Byelorussian music has not been created for either of them. To write music for a Byelorussian national anthem which is genuinely Byelorussian in sound and spirit is a worthy challenge for a Byelorussian composer.

Our music stands in need of good cantatas and operas, based on themes of major consequence. Resources and poetic materials are not lacking. To choose only the most obvious authors who lend themselves to such creative refashioning, one can cite Jakub Kolas, Janka Kupala among the classics; and Masiej Siadnioŭ and Janka Zolak among our contemporaries. The more obvious themes for Byelorussian opera are notable events in our history, e.g., the theme of the Byelorussian Kazaks and stories from the life of our people.

Didactic and inspirational musical compositions for the younger generation are an especially serious lack, one which deserves immediate and sustained attention.

Nothing of value is ever achieved without a major investment of time and effort. But in the case of Byelorussian music the reward for those who labor will be enshrinement in the hearts and incorporation into the culture of the Byelorussian nation.

ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS IN THE BELORUSSIAN SSR:

Soviet Standards and the Documentary Legacy
of the Belorussian Nation*

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted
Harvard University

The complexities inherent in the study of Belorussian archives are indeed greater than those for many nations. Yet never has there been a detailed effort to recount the development of archives and recordkeeping practices in Belorussia.¹ Analyzing the archival evolution is particularly difficult because the territory now constituting the Belorussian SSR had never been united as a single exclusive administrative unit at any time in its history before the Second World War. Even in periods when Belorussian lands were all part of a single larger political entity, such as the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth or the Russian Empire, administrative-territorial divisions were in no way contiguous with present frontiers, and by their nature kept the area divided. Split under the administration of successive — and often rival — political powers, the area has been subjected to many different and alternating administrative, economic, social, legal, and even linguistic

¹ The sketchy survey by A. I. Azarov, "Arkhivnoe delo v Belorussii do Velikoi Oktiabr'skoi sotsialisticheskoi revolutsii," *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten'* [AU BSSR] 10 (1961): 14-19, is the only general published account, although considerably more data is available in general histories of Russian archives, in the compilation by A. Shliubski, *Materyialy da kryuskai historapisi. Dolia knihaskhovau i arkhivau ziamel' kryuskikh i b. Vial. Kn. Litouskaha* (Kaunas, 1925; originally published in *Kryvich*, 1925, no. 9(1), pp. 19-68), and in other more specialized studies.

*Originally presented as a paper to the 25th Anniversary Symposium of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences. Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey, 12 February 1977.

practices, all of which have had an immediate effect on record-keeping—to say nothing of the records that remain.²

As an example of the type of problem involved, under the Russian Empire during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, present Belorussian territories were split among five different guberniias: Vitebsk, Mogilev, Minsk, Grodno, and Vilnius.³ This fragmentation had a direct impact on the dispersion of archival materials, because then, even as now, archival records of governmental agencies tended to be retained locally in administrative centers. Since from present administrative boundaries, their remaining records have little relationship to present territorial configurations.

Occupying the crucial borderland with neither natural nor precise historical frontiers, Belorussia has often looked to cities beyond its present borders for the administrative or cultural centers of the Belorussian nation. Starting already in the fourteenth century, almost all the Belorussian territory became part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and hence came to regard Vilnius as its administrative and cultural center. This is not to say that there were not important administrative and cultural centers within what is now Soviet Belorussia in earlier centuries, but the fact that none ever served as a national capital had much to do with the location of the major archival deposits and traditions that developed.

For example, Vitebsk in the nineteenth century certainly developed as one of the major administrative and cultural centers in the area that is now Belorussia. In terms of institutionalized archives, Vitebsk was one of the three cities designated to form an historical archive in the nineteenth century for records predating Russian imperial rule in the western parts of the empire. The Vitebsk Central Archive of Early Register Books was

² A brief historical survey of administrative-territorial divisions in Belorussia is provided in *Belaruskaia Savetskaiia Entsylapedyia* 12 (1975): 9-10; for more details about Soviet developments see the study by V. A. Krutalevich, *Administrativno-territorial'noe ustroistvo BSSR* (Minsk, 1966).

³ Belorussian place names are cited in this article in transliteration from their present-day official Soviet form, as established for English-language usage by the U.S. Board on Geographic Names. Regrettably these designations coincide with Russian-language versions, but these forms remain the most prevalent in both Western and Soviet usage. The correlation table presented as an appendix to this article provides Belorussia, Russian, and Polish equivalents for Belorussian geographic names.

established there by imperial ukaz in 1852.⁴ But compared to the historical archives established in the same year in Kiev and Vilnius, the Vitebsk archive was a relatively small and understaffed operation from the outset. By the end of the 1880s the archive had collected approximately 1900 court register books and some additional 110 volumes of other documents from the period before the Partitions of Poland. Yet already by 1863 the central archive in Vilnius had amassed close to 19,000 volumes of historical documents from 140 different institutions in the area. And the Vilnius archive itself was set up with jurisdiction over records from the guberniias of Minsk, Grodno, and Vilnius, most of the areas of which are now part of Belorussia. Already by the 1870s, for example, the Vilnius archive had collected over 1900 register books from Minsk gubernia alone, and in the 1880s the archive accessioned an additional 5,000 register books from Grodno gubernia. Meanwhile, the Vitebsk archive was having difficulties even maintaining itself, to the extent that by 1902—with only a single archivist in its employ—it was closed, and all of its holdings transferred to Vilnius.⁵

This development in the late nineteenth century reflects the larger historical reality that the major administrative and cultural center of the area—the natural and traditional center for the storage of historical records from the Belorussian areas—is

⁴ See particularly the history of this institution by R. Mienicki, *Archiwum Akt Dawnych w Witebsku (Centralne Archiwum Witebskie) 1852-1903* (Warsaw, 1939), and the initial inventory of early register books collected listed by A. M. Sozonov, "O`shchaia perechnevaia opis' aktovykh knig sudebnykh mest Vitebskoi i Mogilevskoi gubernii, khраниashchikhsia v Tsentral'nom arkhive v Vitebske," in *Istoriko-iuridicheskie materialy, izvlechnnye iz aktovykh knig gubernii Vitebskoi i Mogilevskoi khраниashchikhsia v Tsentral'nom arkhive v Vitebske 1* (Vitebsk 1871): xiii-lv.

⁵ See especially the history of the Vilnius archive by R. Mienicki, *Archiwum Akt Dawnych w Wilnie w okresie od 1795 do 1922 roku. Rys historyczny* (Warsaw, 1923)), the fiftieth anniversary survey by V. K. Golub, *Piatidesiatiletie Vilenskogo tsentral'nogo arkhiva drevnikh aktovykh knig. Istoricheskii ocherk. 2 apreliia 1852-1902* (Vilnius, 1902), the early published catalogue by N. I. Gorbachevskii, *Katalog drevnim aktovym knigam gubernii: Vilenskoi, Grodnenskoii, Minskoi i Kovenskoi, takzhe knigam некotorykh sudov gubernii Mogilevskoi i Smolenskoi, khраниashchimsia nyne v Tsentral'nom arkhive v Vil'ne* (Vilnius, 1872), the later one by I. I. Sprogis, [*Katalog Vilenskogo tsentral'nogo arkhiva*] ([Vilnius, 1914]; proof copy lacking title page), and the additional coverage of this institution in the Lithuanian section of the Grimsted directory.

now outside of Belorussia as presently constituted. And this historical factor makes it impossible to study and understand Belorussian archives in the narrow context of the present Soviet Republic of Belorussia.

In another sense, looking at Soviet Belorussia as territorially constituted today, this nineteenth century development of the Vitebsk archive and its eventual transfer to Vilnius becomes but one of many possible examples of historical documentation being transferred or removed from the present area of Belorussia. Other examples are almost too numerous to mention. Indeed, soon after the First Partition of Poland, when a large part of the present Belorussian SSR came under the sway of Imperial Russia, Catherine II ordered the transfer of many archival materials from the Radziwiłł family archive in Nesvizh (Pol. Nieśwież) to the imperial capital in St. Petersburg. Later in the 1780s and 1790s, she ordered additional manuscript volumes to be collected from monasteries and churches in the Belorussian area. These trends continued in the nineteenth century through the efforts of imperial archeographical commissions, as well as private collectors and scholars.⁶

The dispersal of records and their removal from Belorussia was certainly not only a prerevolutionary phenomenon. Through the troubled period of revolution and Civil War, examples abound of archival materials—and particularly personal papers and manuscript collections—being removed from Belorussia.⁷ And in the early 1930s there is the important example of the removal of the most politically significant portions of the Radziwiłł archive from

⁶ Shliubski, *Materyialy da kryuskai historapisi*, pp. 14-26, notes instances of the removal of manuscripts and archival materials from Belorussia in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century. For references to Belorussian materials retained in the Imperial Archeological Commission collections in Leningrad and other collections in Moscow and Leningrad, see the references in the Grimsted directory, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Moscow and Leningrad* (Princeton, 1972) and the Supplement 1: *Bibliographical Addenda* (Zug, Switzerland, 1976). For materials collected in Vilnius, most of which are still retained there, see the coverage in the Lithuanian section of the Grimsted directory.

⁷ Some details about Belorussian archival materials taken abroad in this period are given by Shliubski, *Materyialy da kryuskai historapisi*, pp. 19-68, especially pp. 31-36. See also the brief notice by T. Hryb, "Belaruski zahranichny arkhiu u Praze," *Kalosse, Belaruski litaraturno-naukovy chasapis* 1 (Vilnius, 1935):72; part of this collection gathered in Prague between the wars was taken to Paris during the Second World War, but other parts were transferred to Moscow after the war.

Nesvizh — then under Polish rule — to Warsaw, although some remaining parts of this collection are now concentrated in Minsk.⁸ On the other hand, as will be explained below, since the Revolution, there has been much more of an official attempt on the part of Soviet authorities to reconstitute archival concentrations within the territory of their creation.

The conscious dispersal and removal of archival materials from Belorussia is associated with another problem, from which Belorussian archives have not suffered alone. Because of the geographical location of Belorussia in the crucial western borderlands, the area has been subjected to much more than its historical share of wartime destruction and dislocation. The devastating results of the Second World War in this area are only the most recent in a series of tragedies which destroyed many archival materials in Belorussia over the centuries. Yet the dislocations of the Second World War are perhaps most serious, for even those records that survived destruction were in many cases disorganized beyond the recall of the original order from their creating agencies. And there are no adequate data available about the quantities of materials sent off to the West from Belorussia by occupying German authorities, not all of which were returned after the war.⁹

While the types of problems mentioned above serve to complicate the study of archival development in Belorussia, they must not deter the researcher, because such developments are

⁸ See the surveys of the Radziwiłł materials now retained in Minsk by T. E. Leont'eva, "Nesvizhskii arkhiv kniazei Radzivillov (Obzor dokumental'nykh materialov)," *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten'* [AU BSSR] 2 (9) (1961):12-25, and "Dokumental'nye materialy fonda kniazei Radzivillov kak istoricheskii istochnik," in *Voprosy arkhivovedeniia i istochnikovedeniia BSSR*, edited by V. N. Zhigalov et al. (Minsk, 1971), pp. 309-19. Those portions now surviving in the Main Archive of Early Acts (AGAD) in Warsaw are surveyed by B. Smoleńska and T. Zielińska, "Archiwalia prywatne w Archiwum Głównym Akt Dawnych w Warszawie (Archiwa magnackie)," *Archeion* 38 (1962):187-93. See also the coverage by E. Barwiński, "Archiwum ks. Radziwiłłów w Nieświeżu: Rys jego historii i sprawozdanie z poszukiwań," *Archiwum Komisii Historycznej* 11 (1909-1913):1-10; "Wydawnictwa Komisii Historycznej Akademii Umiejętności w Krakowie," no. 70, which describes the holdings when they were still intact in Nesvizh.

⁹ Many reports of archival developments and transfers during the Second World War are included in the U.S. National Archives microfilmed series, "Records of the Reich Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories, 1941-45," series T-454, especially rolls 1, 2, 3, 16, and 107.

really the key to understanding the nature and use of historical documents as sources for written history. Fortunately, the study of archival development in Belorussia has been the subject of some renewed interest in the Soviet Union, as well as in the West. The most significant work on this subject is that undertaken by the Belorussian historian N. N. Ulashchik. However, his most relevant volume is devoted to a specifically archeographical emphasis,¹⁰ and his most recent work has been involved with the publication of early chronicles. Yet, in mentioning his name, it is hard not to note the irony that Ulashchik, as the virtual dean of present-day archival-based study of Belorussian history, is now working, and the products of his research are being published, in Moscow, not in Minsk.

The only recent published research on the subject in Belorussia itself—and of lesser calibre in terms of the depth of scholarly penetration—has been that of the now retired director of the Belorussian Archival Administration. A. I. Azarov prepared his kandidat dissertation for the Moscow State Historico-Archival Institute on the subject of archival development in Belorussia, and most of the substantive parts of this dissertation were published in the short-lived Belorussian archival journal.¹¹ Since his retirement, Azarov has been working on a more detailed study of the subject. Unfortunately much of the important work in the 1920s has since been forgotten, and many of the programs and approaches instituted then never became established as lasting traditions, dying out with the noted authors such as V. I. Picheta, M. V. Dovnar-Zapol'skii, and D. I. Dovgiallo, among others.¹² However the published collection resulting from the 1968 con-

¹⁰ N. N. Ulashchik, *Ocherki po arkheografii i istochnikovedeniiu istorii Belorussii feodal'nogo perioda* (Moscow, 1973).

¹¹ See the published *avtoreferat* of this dissertation, *Arkhivnoe delo v BSSR* (Moscow, 1955), and the articles: "Arkhivnoe delo v Belorussii do Velikoi Oktiabr'skoi sotsialisticheskoi revoliutsii," *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten'* [AU BSSR] 10 (1961):14-19; "Tsentralizatsiia arkhivnogo dela Belorusskoi SSR v 1918-1925 gg.," *ibid.* 11 (1961):3-8; "Arkhivnoe stroitel'stvo v BSSR," *Informatsionnyi biulleten'* [AU BSSR] 5 (1957):3-9; and "50 let sovetskogo arkhivnogo stroitel'stva i zadachi arkhivnykh uchrezhdenii Belorusskoi SSR," in *Voprosy arkhivovedeniia i istochnikovedeniia v BSSR*, pp. 5-16.

¹² See for example the collection of reports from the 1926 archeographical conference in Minsk, *Pratsy pershaha z'ezdu des'ledchykau belaruskai arkhealohii i arkheahrafii 17-18 studzenia 1926 hodu* (Minsk, 1926; "Pratsy i materyialy da historyi i arkhealohii Belarusi").

ference in Minsk demonstrates considerable revived interest in source study and archival investigations.¹³

Developments in the archival realm since the establishment of Soviet rule have been as revolutionary as other transformations in Belorussia. The Soviet Union has undoubtedly developed the most comprehensive and centralized system of archival administration in the world, and the effects of that transformation are immediately apparent in terms of the documentary legacy of the Belorussian nation. Already in 1918 the principle was established of complete nationalization of all documentary materials with a regular system of state archives on all administrative-territorial levels. In subsequent decades there have been huge expenditures for archival buildings and administration. These developments have been accompanied by the imposition of established procedures for the management of records in all governmental agencies and standardized formats for internal organization, arrangement, and description of archival materials. And Belorussian archives have evolved following the regularized system of archival nomenclature throughout all parts of the USSR.¹⁴

On the one hand, such developments have had the most beneficial effect of bringing the vast quantities of records of the nation into formal archival institutions, and providing for their proper preservation, cataloguing, and hence information control. Reports sent regularly to Moscow make it possible to determine exactly what records of what agencies are located in exactly which archives and from which years. And Soviet archivists are now experimenting with advanced techniques of computer indexing and retrieval systems to increase and rationalize control and retrieval possibilities throughout the USSR.

Needless to emphasize, this high level of centralization and rationalization has its counterpart in providing a level of ideo-

¹³ See *Voprosy arkhivovedeniia i istochnikovedeniia v BSSR. Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii arkhivistov i istorikov, posviashchennoi 50-letiiu arkhivnogo stroitel'stva v SSSR*, edited by V. N. Zhigalov et al. (Minsk, 1971).

¹⁴ The article by P. K. Grimsted, "Regional Archival Development in the USSR: Soviet Standards and National Documentary Legacies," *American Archivist* 36 (January 1973):43-66, discusses some of the general Soviet developments in the archival realm. For Belorussian developments, see especially the series of articles by Azarov mentioned in note 11. Many of the laws and regulations governing Belorussian archives under Soviet administration are included in the volume edited by A. I. Azarov, *Arkhivnoe delo v BSSR (1918-1968). Sbornik zakonodatel'nykh i rukovodiashchikh dokumentov*, compiled by E. F. Shorokhov (Minsk, 1972).

logical control. There is scant evidence of deliberate destruction of records for political purposes, although naturally, as in any archival establishment throughout the world, there is considerable weeding out, since there simply is not space to retain all of the paper our twentieth-century society uses in the course of daily activities. What is much more striking to the Western observer, is the extent to which all types of records and other documentary materials have been brought into official state custody from every conceivable type of economic, social, and cultural institution, along with official state records. Special centralized repositories have been established for literary materials, films, and sound recordings, for architectural drawings, and other scientific and technical documentation. In many cases, much to researchers' dissatisfaction, access is relatively limited and research carefully regulated, even for Soviet scholars.¹⁵ The lid may be kept on, but Pandora's box is being constantly filled and enlarged.

The ideological background for these developments is immediately apparent. With the commitment of Marxist-Leninist theory to the interpretation of history as part and parcel of its own ideological justification, and in connection with its own imposition of social and intellectual norms, state-controlled historians and literary critics have needed the records of the past to document their interpretations. And at the same time, the extension of archival jurisdiction goes hand-in-hand with control over all historical materials to insure the viability of established ideological orthodoxy. Such imperatives call not only for the records of prerevolutionary Imperial governmental administration, but also for all of the records of all aspects of society. Hence it is not surprising to read about developments in Belorussia in the 1920s, when archival jurisdiction was extended to include the widest possible range of the national documentary legacy, from medieval charters to early twentieth-century factory records, from seventeenth-century court registers to the most recent photographs of Party meetings.

And what was even more significant for archival developments in Belorussia, major concentrations of records that had been taken out of the republic on earlier occasions were sought out and attempts were made to bring them back under the control of the Belorussian archival administration. This development

¹⁵ For example, a report on research topics in Belorussian central state archives during the years 1971-1972 (the only years covered by a published report), *Tematika issledovaniy po dokumentam gosudarstvennykh arkhivov BSSR za 1971-1972 gg. Spravochnik* (Minsk, 1974), gives some suggestions of the type of research being carried out by Soviet scholars.

started right after the First World War with the signing of the Treaty of Riga, providing for revindication of archival materials to the territory of their original creation. Even many register books that had earlier in the nineteenth century been stored in the Vitebsk historical archive, taken to Vilnius in 1902, and then evacuated in 1914, were eventually brought back to Belorussia. And this trend has become even more pronounced after the Second World War.

Such rationalization of archival storage in accordance with present territorial divisions has created all sorts of problems. Successive revamping of administrative units and their associated archives, to say nothing of shifts in international boundaries and ensuing documentary migrations, have contributed many difficulties that are not yet satisfactorily resolved. They are even more baffling to the researcher abroad, who often has little access to reliable information about such developments. The principle now remains strong that archival records are to be stored within present territorial administrative units that encompass the place of their initial creation. Tremendous efforts have been made to carry out this principle, particularly in the case of official state records and Party archives. Thus, in the 1960s, many court register books from the period before the establishment of Russian imperial rule in the area in the late eighteenth century, have been transferred from Vilnius to Minsk. (Originally many of these were taken to Grodno and Mogilev, which earlier had been the seats of historical archives with jurisdiction over these materials). And the process is still continuing, with examples of many other types of records.¹⁶ The highly disputed jurisdiction over the Lithuanian Metrica, nevertheless, remains in the hands of the Central State Archive of Ancient Acts in Moscow, but this is justified under current archival practice, because the records themselves pertain to areas that now constitute several different republics in the USSR.¹⁷

This type of rationalized archival organization throughout the USSR may appear as part of a much larger program of con-

¹⁶ Many of the materials transferred to Belorussia from other Soviet archives are mentioned in the introductions to the published Belorussian archival guides listed below. Additional information on these developments was provided to the author by Soviet archival authorities.

¹⁷ For the relevance of the Lithuanian Metrica to Belorussian history, see the short study by D. Dovgiallo (Z. Dauhiala), *Litouskaia Metryka i iae kashtounasts' dlia vyvuchennia minuushchyny Belarusi* (Riga, 1933; originally published in *Pratsy pershaha z'ezdu das'ledchkau belaruskai arkhealohii i arkheahrafii 17-18 studzenia 1926 hodu* [Minsk, 1926]).

trolled promotion of national identity. But in terms of Belorussian archives, its result is a tremendous enrichment of the holdings to an extent that was never known in the past. And it brings with it vast modern facilities for adequate storage and for preservation work, along with a large staff of increasingly trained specialists for cataloguing, restoration, and documentary publication.

Many of these general factors under discussion become apparent in the current organization of archives in the Belorussian SSR. Hence, it might be helpful to summarize briefly the main repositories as they are presently organized. As is immediately evident even the names of present-day repositories in Belorussia are the exact counterparts of similar types of institutions in Moscow and Leningrad and in other republics of the USSR.¹⁸

Most important in terms of the bulk and extent of holdings is the network of state archives organized under the jurisdiction of the centralized Archival Administration of the Belorussian SSR of the republic-level Council of Ministers (Arkhipnoe upravlenie pri Sovete ministrov BSSR]. As currently organized, there are six so-called central state archives in Belorussia:

1. The Central State Historical Archive in Minsk [Tsentral'ny dziazhaŭny histarychny arkhiŭ Belaruskai SSR u h. Minsku (TsDHA BSSR-Minsk) / Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Belorusskoi SSR v g. Minske (TsGIA BSSR-Minsk)] has

For details about the extant registers of the Lithuanian Metrica now in TsGADA, see the forthcoming revised edition of the prerevolutionary catalogue by S. Ptaszycki (S. Ptashitskii), *Opisanie knig i aktov Litovskoi metriki* (St. Petersburg, 1887), edited by Patricia K. Grimsted and Irena Sułkowska-Kurasiowa, *The "Lithuanian Metrica" in Moscow and Warsaw: A Reedition of the Ptaszycki 1887 Inventory, with an Introduction and Indication of Current Locations* (Newtonville, MA: Oriental Research Partners, forthcoming). For related early copies in Warsaw see the article by I. Sułkowska-Kurasiowa, "Metryka Litewska — charakterystyka i dzieje," *Archeion* 65 (1977): 91-118. See also the study by N. G. Berezhkov, *Litovskaia metrika kak istoricheskii istochnik*, part 1: *O pervonachal'nom sostave knig Litovskoi metriki po 1522 god* (Moscow, 1946).

¹⁸ The most extensive published survey of Belorussian state archives by A. A. Azarov, "50 let sovetskogo arkhivnogo stroitel'stva i zadachi arkhivnykh uchrezhdenii Belorusskoi SSR," *Voprosy arkhivovedeniia i istochnikovedeniia v BSSR*, pp. 5-16, should be supplemented by reference to the published guides to individual repositories listed below. Additional information has been furnished the author by Belorussian archival authorities. See also the collection of Belorussian archival regulations cited in note 14.

consolidated all historical records from the prerevolutionary period originating in the guberniias of Mogilev, Minsk, and Vitebsk.¹⁹ It was established in Minsk in 1963 in a new building especially constructed for its use, on the basis of the earlier Central State Historical Archive of the Belorussian SSR previously housed in Mogilev.²⁰ And it also took custody of all of the prerevolutionary holdings that had earlier been retained in the oblast archive in Minsk. The bulk of TsDHA holdings are from the period of imperial Russian rule in those guberniias. In addition, however, TsDHA-Minsk now also serves as the only centralized historical repository for archival materials from the period during which Belorussia was part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and under the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Thus pre-nineteenth-century records originating in the entire present area of Belorussia have been collected here, many of which were earlier retained in Vitebsk, Grodno, and Vilnius.

2. The Central State Historical Archive of the Belorussian SSR in Grodno [Tsentral'ny dziazhaŭny histarychny arkhiŭ Belaruskai SSR u h. Hrodne (TsDHA BSSR-Hrodno) / Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Belorusskoi SSR v g. Grodno (TsGIA BSSR-Grodno)] now serves as a centralized historical repository for materials originating in the area of the present western oblasts of Belorussia dating from the late eighteenth century.²¹ Thus its principal holdings are those from the former pre-revolutionary guberniia of Grodno and those districts of the Vilnius guberniia that now constitute part of the Belorussian SSR. The archive has as its basis the holdings that were brought together during the interwar period in the State Archive [Archiwum Państwowe w Grodnie] which had been organized there as part of the Polish archival system.²² Before 1964 the Grodno archive

¹⁹ See the recent general guide, *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv BSSR v Minske. Putevoditel'*, compiled by A. G. Azarova et al., edited by T. A. Vorob'eva et al. (Minsk, 1974).

²⁰ A guide to the earlier central archive in Mogilev was published, *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Belorusskoi SSSR. Putevoditel'*, [compiled by V. A. Gusarevich et al.], edited by E. P. Luk'ianov et al. (Mogilev, 1959), but should be consulted with caution now, since considerable reorganization and changes in fond numbers have proceeded following the transfer of the holdings to Minsk..

²¹ See the guide *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv Belorusskoi SSR v gor. Grodno. Putevoditel'*, compiled by L. V. Arzhaeva et al., edited by E. Iu. Kopysskii et al. (Minsk, 1965), published after the 1964 reorganization when most of the pre-nineteenth-century holdings were transferred to Minsk.

also held a considerable body of early materials from the period of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. These included a large number of court register books and other historical documents, over 6,000 items of which had been transferred to Grodno from the Lithuanian state archives in 1960. However, in 1964, all of the pre-nineteenth-century records were transferred to Minsk.

3. The Central State Archive of the October Revolution and Socialist Development of the Belorussian SSR [Tsentral'ny dziazhaŭny arkhiŭ Kastrychnitskai revaliutsyi i satsialistychnaha budauŭnitstva Belaruskai SSR (TsDAKR BSSR / Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva Belorusskoi SSR (TsGAOR GSSR)] serves as a consolidated repository for official records of government, social, and economic institutions and organizations since the establishment of Soviet rule in Belorussia.²³ This archive suffered considerable destruction during the Second World War, but the large bulk of its holdings has been preserved.

4. The Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of the Belorussian SSR [Tsentral'ny dziazhaŭny arkhiŭ-muzei literatury i mastatstva Belaruskai SSR (TsDAMLM BSSR) / Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i iskusstva Belorusskoi SSR (TsGAMLI)] is a relatively new institution, established on the pattern of TsGALI SSR in Moscow, as a centralized repository for materials relating to the cultural history of Belorussia.²⁴ In 1976 it was reorganized as a combined archive and museum and is being moved to a suitable historical building which is being restored to house its contents.

5. The Central State Archive for Scientific and Technical Documentation of the Belorussian SSR [Tsentral'ny dziazhaŭny arkhiŭ navukova-tekhnichnai dokumentatsyi Belaruskai SSR

²² See the earlier descriptions, "Archiwum Państwowe w Grodnie," *Archeion* 5 (1929):35-36, which was followed by brief annual reports in subsequent issues of *Archeion*, and the later article by F. Aleksandrov, "Grodnskii arkhiv," *Arkhivnoe delo*, 1940 no. 4(56), pp. 60-64.

²³ See the guide, *Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva BSSR. Putevoditel'* [compiled by N. I. Buldakova et al.], edited by A. I. Azarov et al. (Minsk, 1967).

²⁴ A paragraph mentioning major holdings is included in *Belaruskaiia Savetskaiia Entsiklapedyia* 11 (1974):148, and subsequent developments were described to the author by the director in Minsk in 1976.

(TsDANTD BSSR) / Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv nauchno-tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii Belorusskoi SSR (TsGANTD BSSR)] is modelled also after its Moscow counterpart, TsGANTD SSSR.²⁵ The archive serves as a centralized repository for technical plans, such as architectural blueprints and engineering drawings, particularly those relating to the post-World War II reconstruction in Minsk and other cities of the Belorussian SSR.

6. The Central State Archive of Film, Photo-, and Phonographic Documents of the Belorussian SSR [Tsentral'ny dziazhaŭny arkhiiŭ kinafotafonadakumentaŭ Belaruskai SSR (TsDAKFFD BSSR)] Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotofonodokumentov Belorusskoi SSR (TsGAKFFD BSSR)] was founded as a separate archive after the Second World War. It serves as a centralized depository for documentary films, photographs, and sound recordings.²⁶

In addition to these central state archives in Belorussia today, there are an additional six oblast state archives, one for each of the six oblasts of the Belorussian SSR, located in the administrative centers of Brest,²⁷ Gomel',²⁸ Grodno,²⁹ Minsk,³⁰ Mogilev,³¹ and Vitebsk.³² All of these oblast archives have two or three

²⁵ See the brief description by A. V. Vorob'ev and R. G. Mironova, "Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv nauchno-tekhnicheskoi dokumentatsii Belorusskoi SSR," *Sovetskie arkhivy*, 975, no. 1, pp. 66-71.

²⁶ There is no up-to-date published description of the archive except the brief paragraph in *Belaruskaiia Savetskaiia Entsyklapedyia* 11 (1974): 148, and the earlier summary of holdings by K. Komarova and T. Dobuzhskaia, "Dokumental'nye materialy TsGAKFFD BSSR," *Informatsionnyi biulleten'* [AU BSSR] 6 (1958):86-89.

²⁷ See the guide *Gosudarstvennye arkhivy Brestskoi, Grodnenskoi oblastei, filial Gosudarstvennogo arkhiva Minskoi oblasti v Molodechno. Spravochnik (po dokumental'nym materialam 1919-1939 gg.)*, compiled by T. F. Kirichenko et al. (Minsk, 1969).

²⁸ See the guide *Gosudarstvennye arkhivy Gomel'skoi i Mogilevskoi oblastei. Spravochnik (1917-1941 gg.)*, compiled by L. N. Kislova et al., edited by A. I. Azarov et al. (Minsk, 1970).

²⁹ See the guide listed in note 27.

³⁰ See the guide, *Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Minskoi oblasti i ego filial v gorode Molodechno. Putevoditel' (1917-1941 gg.)*, compiled by G. A. Grechkin et al., edited by T. A. Vorob'eva et al. (Minsk, 1967).

³¹ See the guide listed in note 28.

³² See the guide *Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Vitebskoi oblasti i ego filial v Polotske. Putevoditel' (1917-1941 gg.)*, compiled by Z. A. Zhuravleva and A. V. Syrtsova, edited by A. I. Azarov et al. (Minsk, 1972).

branches, many of which were previously separate oblast archives or city archives under earlier administrative-territorial configurations in the republic. Oblast archives in the Belorussian SSR are limited in their holdings to local materials from the post-revolutionary Soviet period. Their prerevolutionary holdings, which had been rich in many cases, were all transferred to the central state historical archives at various earlier points, in Minsk as late as 1964. By the same token, the holdings in most of the branch oblast archives in Belorussia are limited to records post-dating the Second World War. Pre-Second World War records from local archives have for the most part been transferred to TsDAKR BSSR in Minsk, or to the state oblast archives. Local records from the Polish period (1921-1939) in those areas that were part of Poland between the wars have predominantly been concentrated in the oblast archives in Grodno and Brest, as well as the Molodechno branch of the Minsk Oblast Archive,³³ although a few scattered records from the Polish period remain in other repositories.

While the archival administration of the Belorussian SSR retains jurisdiction over all of the state archives of Belorussia and their holdings, as in the case of other Soviet republics, some significant groups of records remain outside its immediate jurisdiction. Most important by far, the Party Archive under the control of the Institute of Party History of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia [Partiiny arkhiŭ Instytutu historyi Partyi pry Tsentral'nom kamitetse Kamunistychnai Partyi Belarusi (PA IHP TsK KPB) / Partiinyi arkhiv Instituta istorii Partii pri Tsentral'nomu komitete Kommunisticheskoi Partii Belorussii (PA IIP TsK KPB)] contains many of the politically most significant records of the Soviet period in Belorussia.³⁴ In addition to the main Party Archive in Minsk, subsidiary Party archives on the oblast level also retain records under Party archival administration.

Unlike the situation in the Baltic republics, the Ukraine, and many other parts of the Soviet Union, archives and manuscript divisions of libraries and other institutions under the Academy of Sciences and the Ministry of Culture in Belorussia are of

³³ See the specialized guide *Gosudarstvennye arkhivy Brestskoi, Grodenskoi oblastei, filial Gosudarstvennogo arkhiva Minskoi oblasti v Molodechno. Spravochnik (po dokumental'nykh materialam 1919-1939 gg.)*, compiled by T. F. Kirichenko et al., edited by V. N. Zhigalov et al. (Minsk, 1969).

³⁴ See the brief survey of Belorussian Party archives by S. Z. Pochanin, "Partiinye arkhivy Belorussii—dokumental'naia baza istorii KPB," in *Voprosy arkhivovedeniia i istochnikovedeniia v BSSR*, pp. 17-32.

much less importance in terms of the wealth and the extent of their manuscript and archival holdings. This is due largely to the fact that during the nineteenth and early twentieth century there were relatively few—and at that relatively small—concentrations of manuscript collections and other archival holdings in such institutions. Aside from the special depositories organized in ecclesiastical seminaries under the control of the local church archeological committees in the several prerevolutionary Belorussian guberniias, there were no major libraries or museums in the area.³⁵ Since the Second World War the main library of the Academy of Sciences of the Belorussian SSR in Minsk has been developing its manuscript division, most particularly with personal papers of individuals associated with the Academy of Sciences.³⁶ And the Institute of Art, Ethnography, and Folklore of the Belorussian Academy of Sciences, has also developed a rich folklore collection.³⁷ The largest library in Minsk, the Lenin State Library, has a relatively small manuscript and rare-book division which still contains some of the remaining fragments of collections that had been developed before the Revolution by local religious archeographic efforts.³⁸ A few such manuscript books, most notably those from Vitebsk are now also to be found

³⁵ Some coverage of miscellaneous archival concentrations in pre-revolutionary Belorussian areas is provided by Shliubski, *Materyialy da kryuskai historapisi* and Auhien Kachanovski (A. Kalubovich), *Mova u historyi belaruskaha pis'menstva*. 1. *Uvodzny. Lios pomnikau staroha belaruskaha pis'menstva (rukapisnaha i drukavanaha)* (Munich/London, 1974-75; 2: *Uvodziny. Dasiuleshni stan vyvuchennia pomnikau belaruskaha pis'menstva X-XVIII st.st. (Histaryiahrafichny ahliad)* (Cleveland, 1978), as well as scattered references by V. S. Ikonnikov, *Opyt russkoi istoriografii* (2 vols. in 4; Kiev, 1891-1908; reprint edition: Osnabrück, 1966), and more specialized studies.

³⁶ See the recent survey by L. I. Zbralevich, "Redkie knigi i rukopisi v fondakh biblioteki Akademii nauk BSSR," in *Bibliotечноe delo i bibliografiia v sisteme bibliotek Akademii nauk BSSR (Sbornik statei)* (Minsk, 1976), pp. 37-46. As yet there is no description of the separate archive of the Belorussian Academy of Sciences, established in 1952.

³⁷ See the article by M. I. Hrynblat (Grinblat), "Belorusskaia sovet-skaia etnografiia za 30 let," *Sovetskaia etnografiia*, 1948, no. 2, pp. 219-25. Most of the extensive folklore archive collected earlier was destroyed in the course of the Second World War.

³⁸ See the description of some of the manuscripts from these collections compiled by V. N. Peretts, *Rukopisi biblioteki Moskovskogo universiteta, Samarskikh biblioteki i muzeia i Minskikh sobranii* (Leningrad, 1934); the microfiche edition edited with preface by P. K. Grimsted (Zug, Switzerland: IDC, 1981), notes those manuscripts still extant in Minsk.

in the State Museum of the Belorussian SSR, although approximately half of this collection was lost during the Second World War.³⁹

The memorial museums of Yakub Kolas and Yanka Kupala from private collections and in some cases from other repositories have gathered some manuscript materials relating to these writers throughout the USSR.⁴⁰ They are being developed as centralized archives for manuscripts and other papers as well as study centers, in cooperation with the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences, although they themselves are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Culture.

Several other museums in other areas of Belorussia—notably the regional historical museum in Grodno, and the regional museum in Vitebsk, have also some concentrations of historical documents, but their collections are much smaller now than they were during the 1920s, when they were described in earlier directories.

This brief survey has served to highlight the principal archives and other manuscript repositories as they are presently organized in the Belorussian SSR. More details about their holdings, in almost all cases, are available in the published guides indicated. In fact, published descriptions of state archives in Belorussia are more numerous and comprehensive than for most other Soviet republics. Relatively up-to-date guides have been published within the last ten years, providing at least basic schematic coverage—in most instances researchers might prefer much more detail—of major holdings in the principal state central archives (except the three most recently established ones: TsDANTD, TsDAMLM, and TsDAKFFD) and the six oblast archives, in many cases including coverage of the holdings of the branch archives.⁴¹ Researchers should note, nonetheless, that all of these guides have been published in the Russian language and none of them provide any Belorussian equivalents for the names of institutions, individuals, or geographical locations. During the years 1956-1961, the archival administration in Belorussia also published its own professional journal which included articles about archival developments and holdings in the republic.⁴² However,

³⁹ The description by Peretts cited in note 38 above also covers many of the manuscripts now in the State Museum.

⁴⁰ There are no published descriptions of the manuscript holdings of either of these museums.

⁴¹ These publications are all listed in appropriate footnotes above.

⁴² *Informatsionnyi biulleten'* [AU MVD BSSR] (7 numbers in 6 issues; Minsk, 1956-1959), and its successor, *Nauchno-informatsionnyi biulleten'* [AU pri SM BSSR] (4 issues; Minsk, 1960-1961).

since 1961, no further issues have appeared. The archival administration has also sponsored, as have the various institutes of the Belorussian Academy of Sciences, the publication of various collections of historical sources, bibliographical surveys of which are also available.⁴³

As yet, foreign researchers have had little opportunity to work in Belorussian archives. In fact no Americans have been admitted for research in any of the state archives there. However, as is apparent from exchange program applications in recent years—at least in America—there have been very few applications from graduate students and other scholars. To be sure, much research on Belorussian subjects in the humanities and social sciences will by necessity continue to center in Moscow, Leningrad, and Vilnius. But as more information is available about the archives in Belorussia, their organization and increasingly rich holdings, more efforts should be made to promote active research in the field among graduate students and postdoctoral scholars. Research and teaching in the fields of history and culture of the USSR need to branch away from the prevalent Great Russian focus that for decades has been dominant in the West.

NOTES

This paper is drawn from materials presented in the Belorussian section of the author's volume, **Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia**, published by Princeton University Press in 1981, included jointly in the series "Studies of the Russian Institute, Columbia University," and "Harvard Monographs in Ukrainian Studies." For more detailed coverage of the subject and bibliography of related reference materials, the reader is referred to that volume; hence footnote citations in this paper will be minimal.

Because of publication delays, it has not been possible to update this paper. In connection with the publication of this volume, a correlated collection of the published finding-aids and related reference materials listed has been issued in microfiche editions by Inter Documentation Company, Zug, Switzerland. Microfiche order numbers are included in bibliographical references in the

⁴³ See the survey of documentary publications presented by L. V. Arzhaeva, "Publikatsii istoricheskikh istochnikov v BSSR," in **Voprosy arkhivovedeniia i istochnikovedeniia v BSSR**, pp. 293-305, and the earlier one by M. Zaloga, "Obzor publikatorskoi raboty v Belorussii za 40 let sovet-skoi vlasti," **Informatsionnyi biulleten'** [AU BSSR] 6 (1958):16-37.

published volume, and a separate catalogue of the microfiche editions is now available from IDC.

The preparation of this volume and hence also the present paper was carried out under grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, to which the author remains deeply indebted. Field research and consultations in the Soviet Union, including visits to Minsk in 1970 and 1976, were carried out under the academic exchange between the American Council of Learned Societies and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, administered by the International Research and Exchanges Board. The author is particularly grateful for the cooperation and assistance of many staff members of the Academy of Sciences of the Belorussian SSR, the Archival Administration of the Council of Ministers of the Belorussian SSR, and the Lenin State Library in Minsk.

BYELORUSSIAN GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

BELORUSSIAN GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

Belorussian	Belorussian	Polish
Ашмяны	Ashmiany (Lit. Ašmena)	Oszmiana
Бабінавічы	Babinavichy	Babinowicze
Бабруйск	Babruisk	Bobrujsk
Баранавічы	Baranavichy	Baranowicze
Барысаў	Barysaŭ	Borysów
Беласток	[Belastok (now in Pol.)]	Białystok
Беліца	Belitsa	Bielica
Бельск	[Bel'sk (now in Pol.)]	Bielsk (after 1918, Bielsk Podlaski)
Браслаў	Braslaŭ (Lit. Breslauja)	Brasław
Брэст (Бярэсце)	Brest (formerly Biares'tse)	Brześć Litewski (after 1918, Brześć [nad Bugiem])
Быхаў	Bykhaŭ	Bychów (before 1952, Stary Bychów) (before 1852 Staryi Bykhov)
Чачэрск	Chachersk	Czeczersk
Чавусы	Chavusy	Czausy
Чэрвень (Ігумен)	Cherven' (before 1923, Ihumen')	Czerwień
Чэрыкаў	Cherykaŭ	Czeryków
Давыд-Гарадок	Davyd-Haradok	Dawidgródek
Докшыцы	Dokshytsy	Dokszyce
Драгічын	Drahichyn	Drohiczyn
Дрыса	Drysa	Dryssa
Дуброўна	Dubraŭna	Dubrowna
Дзісна	Dzisna	Dzisna
Гарадок	Haradok	Gródek
Глыбокае	Hlybokae	Głębokie
Гомель	Homel'	Homel
Горкі	Horki	Horki
Гродна (Горадня)	Hrodna (earlier Horadnia)	Grodno
Ігумен (Чэрвень)	Ihumen (after 1923, Cherven')	Ihumen

Russian
(prerevolutionary)
(LC transliteration)

Oshmiany

Babinovichi
Bobruisk
Baranovichi
Borisov
Belostok

Belitsa
Bel'sk

Braslav

Brest Litovsk (after
1918, Brest)

Bykhov (before 1852,

Chechersk
Chaussy
Cherven'

Cherikov
David-Gorodok
Dokshitsy
Drogichin
Drissa
Dubrovno
Disna
Gorodok
Glubokoe
Gomel'
Gorki
Grodno

Igumen

Russian

Ошмяны

Бабиновичи
Бобруйск
Барановичи
Борисов
Белосток

Белица
Бельск

Браслав

Брест

Быхов

Чечерск
Чаусы
Червень

Чериков
Давид-Городок
Докшицы
Дрогичин
Дриса
Дубровно
Дисна
Городок
Глубокое
Гомель
Горки
Гродно

Игумен

Belorussian	Belorussian	Polish
Калінін	Kalinin (okrug)	Kalinin
Капыль	Kapyl'	Kopyl
Клімавічы	Klimavichy	Klimowicze
Кобрын	Kobryn	Kobryń
Копысь	Kopys'	Kopyś
Крычаў	Krychaŭ	Krzyczew
Лепель	Lepel'	Lepel
Ліда	Lida (Lit. Lyda)	Lida
Магілёў	Mahilioŭ	Mohylew (Mohylów)
Маладзечна	Maladzechna	Mołodeczno
Мазыр	Mazyr	Mozyrz
Мілаславічы	Milaslavichy	Miłosławicze
Мінск (Менск)	Minsk (1923-1938, Mensk)	Mińsk
Мсціслаў	Mstsislaŭ	Mścisław
Навагрудак (Наваградак)	Navahrudak (earlier Navahradak)	Nowogródek
Невель	[Nevel' (now in RSFSR)]	Newel
Нясвіж	Niasvizh (Lit. Nesvyžius)	Nieśwież
Орша (Ворша)	Orsha (earlier Vorsha)	Orsza
Пінск	Pinsk	Pińsk
Палессе	Palesse	Polesie
Паставы	Pastavy	Postawy
Полацк (Полацак)	Polatsk (earlier Polatsak)	Połock
Пружаны	Pruzhany	Prużana
Рагачоў	Rahachoŭ	Rohaczew (Rogaczew)
Рэчыца	Rechytsa	Rzeczyca
Саколка	[Sakolka (now in Pol.)]	Sokółka
Себеж	[Sebezh now in RSFSR)]	Siebież

Russian

Kalinin

Kopyl'
Klimovich

Kobrin

Kopys' (Kopys)
(after 1861, Gorki)
Krichev

Lepel'
Lida

Mogilev

Molodechno
Mozyr'
Miloslavichi
Minsk

Mstislavl'

Novogrudok

Nevel'

Nesvizh

Orsha

Pinsk
Poles'e
Postavy
Polotsk

Pruzhany

Rogachev
Rechitsa

Sokolka

Sebezh

Russian

Калинин

Копыль
Климовичи
Кобрин
Копысь

Кричев

Лепель
Лида

Могилев

Молодечно
Мозырь
Милославичи
Минск

Мстиславль

Новогрудок

Невель

Несвиж

Орша

Пинск
Полесье
Поставы
Полоцк

Пружаны

Рогачев
Речица

Соколка

Себеж

Belorussian**Belorussian****Polish**

Шклоў
Сянно
Слонім
Слуцк (Слуцк)
Стары Быхаў
(Быхаў)
Сураж

Shkloŭ
Sianno
Slonim
Slutsk
Stary Bykhaŭ
(after 1852, Bykhaŭ)
Surazh

Szklów
Sienna
Słonim
Słuck
Stary Bychów
after 1852, Bychów)
Suraz

Тураў

Turaŭ

Turów

Валожын
Ваўкавыск
Веліж

Valozhyn
Vaŭkavusk
[Velizh
(now in RSFSR)]

Wołożyn
Wołkowysk
Wieliz

Вілейка (Вялейка)
Вільня
Віцебск
Ворша (Орша)

Vileika (also Vialeika)
[Vil'nia (Lit. Vilnius)]
Vitsebsk
Vorsha (now Orsha)

Wilejka
Wilno
Witebsk
Orsza

Жлобін
Жыровічы

Zhlobin
Zhyrovichy

Żłobin
Żyrowice

Russian

Russian

Shklov
Senno
Slonim
Slutsk
Staryi Bykhov
 (after 1852, Bykhov)
Surazh

Шклов
Сенно
Слоним
Слуцк
Стары Быхов

Сураж

Туров

Воложин
Волковыск
Велиж

Вилейка
Вильно (Вильна)
Витебск
Орша

Жлобин
Жировицы

Turov

Volozhin
Volkovysk
Velizh

Vileika
Vil'no (Vil'na)
Vitebsk
Orsha

Zhlobin
Zhirovichi

BELORUSSIAN GEOGRAPHIC NAMES WITH RUSSIAN AND POLISH EQUIVALENTS*

Patricia Kennedy Grimsted
Harvard University

There is no simple, universally accepted system of rendering Belorussian geographical names in English. Any system adopted is bound to raise controversy. Official names in use in the area at different times varied, and remain at variance with present-day usage. This variance results in some cases from changes in the actual name in different periods, and in other cases from changes in the official language of government. Particularly in the case of Belorussia, general usage in both the Soviet Union and the West is less than satisfying to feelings of national and linguistic identity, since it gives preference to the Russian rather than the Belorussian-language versions. Hence it appears appropriate to present a list of Belorussian forms here together with their Russian and Polish equivalents.

From the time of the partitions of Poland in the late eighteenth century, when Belorussia became part of the Russian Empire, until the revolutions of 1917, Russian place names were always used officially, and thus became known abroad. After the Revolution, political and cultural developments complicated the matter, because Belorussian lands were split between the Soviet Union and Poland. Cyrillic-alphabet Belorussian forms became used officially in Eastern Belorussia; Polish-language forms prevailed in Western areas; while Russian-language forms continued to be used in Moscow. Latin-alphabet renditions of Belorussian place names were used in some areas in the 1920s and amongst some Belorussian émigrés, but these did not long continue in favor, and have now become obsolete. They do not conform to the

* This list of Belorussian geographical names is reprinted with permission of the publisher from the volume, **Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia** (Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 614-15. The introduction was adapted from Appendix 2 of that volume. The list was prepared to accompany the charts and maps of administrative-territorial divisions presented in that volume in Appendix 3, to which readers are referred.

Library of Congress transliteration system. Although the Belorussian language is the official language of the Soviet Republic of Belorussia, official maps published in Moscow invariably use Russian-language forms. Virtually all standard atlases and gazetteers published in English in both Great Britain and the United States adhere to these Russian forms, although there are some minor differences in transliteration. The American government, in standards set by the U.S. Board on Geographic Names, has officially adopted these Russian-language forms. The equivalent Belorussian forms are nowhere provided in Board on Geographic Names gazetteers. For place names in its catalogues, the Library of Congress also uses the Russian names established by the Board on Geographic Names, and does not even furnish Belorussian cross-references. As a result of such traditions, Belorussian forms are little known in the West and even in the Soviet Union. For example, all of the available guides to Belorussian archives published in recent decades in the Soviet Union have been prepared in the Russian language, and list no Belorussian equivalents for place names or institutions.

The present chart of Belorussian geographical names with Russian and Polish equivalents makes no claim to be a comprehensive guide. It presents the names of the most important cities which served as administrative centers on provincial (*guberniia*) and district (*uezd*) levels before the Revolution and on the *okrug* and *oblast'* level in Soviet times. It also includes provincial (*województwo*) and district (*powiat*) centers under Polish rule, and a few other significant geographical names.

The spelling of Belorussian names—both in the Cyrillic original and the transliterated version—is based on official Belorussian-language maps printed in the Belorussian SSR. Earlier variants—used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, or briefly in the interwar period—are derived from historical sources, for example the form “Mensk” used in earlier centuries, and officially from 1923-1938. Russian and Polish equivalents are derived from a variety of sources, most of which are listed in the selected bibliography below.

Transliteration is based on the Library of Congress system (omitting the use of ligatures), which, it should be noted, varies considerably from the Latinized Belorussian forms used in some areas in the 1920s. Transliteration of Russian forms, it should also be noted, varies slightly from the system used by the Board on Geographic Names and from the system used by the United Nations. Hence we use here the form “Belorussia,” instead of the United Nations version “Byelorussia.”

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atlas historyczny Polski.** 2d ed. Edited by Władysław Czapliński and Tadeusz Ładogórski. Warsaw: Państwowe Przedsiębiorstwo Wydawnictw Kartograficznych, 1970. 55 p.
- Batowski, Henryk.** *Słownik nazw miejscowych Europy środkowej i wschodniej XIX i XX wieku. Współczesne i historyczne nazwy miast i innych najważniejszych miejscowości w 24 językach.* Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964. 86 p.
- Belaruskaja Savetskaja Entsiklapedyia,** vol. 12. Minsk, 1975.
- Bol'shaia Sovetskaja Entsiklopediia.** 3d ed. Moscow, 1970. And earlier editions.
- Brockhaus (Brokgauz) and Efron.** *Entsiklopedičeskii slovar'.* St. Petersburg, 1890-1907.
- Florczak, Zofia.** *Udział regionów w kształtowaniu piśmiennictwa polskiego XVI wieku. Studium z zakresu socjologii pisarstwa.* Wrocław/Warsaw/Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1967. 339 p. + folder: *Mapy.* "Studia staropolskie," vol. 17.
- Historyia Belaruskai SSR.** 5 vols. Edited by I. M. Ihnatsenka, L. S. Abetsedarskyi, et al. Minsk: Vyd-va „Navuka i tekhnika,” 1972-1975.
- Istoriia Belorusskoi SSR.** 2d ed. Edited by L. S. Abetsedarskyi, K. I. Shabunia, et al. 2 vols. Minsk: Izd-vo AN BSSR, 1961. 654 p., 698 p.
- Jakubowski, Jan.** *Mapa Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w połowie XVI wieku. Pt 1, Część Północna.* Cracow, 1928. "Atlas historyczny Polski," ser. B, "Mapy przeglądowe," no. 1.
- Krutalevich, V. A.** *Administrativno-territorial'noe ustroistvo BSSR.* Minsk: Izd-vo "Nauka i tekhnika," 1966. 133 p.
- Podziały administracyjne Królestwa Polskiego w okresie 1815-1918 r. (Zarys historyczny. — (Mapy).** Compiled by Wojciech Trzebiński (text) and Adam Borkiewicz (maps). 2 parts. Warsaw, 1956. "Dokumentacja Geograficzna," no. 4 and no. 4a (maps). 112 p. + maps.
- Russisches geographisches Namenbuch.** Edited by Max Vasmer and Herbert Bräuer. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964—(available in 1978: to vol. 9, sec. 1, to "Tyszewce" [Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz]).
- Semenov, Petr Petrovich.** *Geograficheskoe-statisticheskii slovar' Rossiiskoi imperii.* 5 vols. St. Petersburg: [Tip. V. Bezobrazova], 1863-1865.
- Słownik geograficzny Królestwa polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich.** 14 vols. + 2 supplements (in 3 pts.). Edited by Filip Sulimierski, Bronisław Chlebowski, and Władysław Walewski. Warsaw: Nakładem F. Sulimierskiego i W. Walewskiego, 1880-1914. Facsimile reprint edition: Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Artystyczne i Filmowe, 1975-1978.
- SSSR.** *Administrativno-territorial'noe delenie soiuznykh respublik na 1 ianvaria 1974 goda.* Moscow, 1974. 783 p. And earlier editions.
- U.S. Board on Geographic Names.** *Official Standard Names: Gazetteer.* no. 42: USSR. 2d ed. 7 vols. Washington, D.C., 1970.

THE EARLY BYELORUSSIAN PRESENCE IN AMERICA

Vitaŭt Kipel

The New York Public Library

The Byelorussian presence in America is not a familiar concept to the American people. This is in sharp contrast to the situation in Byelorussia where people know that someone on their block, or in the family, or even a close relative went many years ago to America. Even though emigration from Byelorussia to the United States stopped well over half a century ago, the fact remains in the memory of the people that great numbers of Byelorussians went to America and remained there. The expression "he went to America" or "he has an uncle in America" became common sayings among Byelorussians. The close ties with the United States are especially visible at the present time when thousands of second-generation Americans visit their relatives in Soviet Byelorussia.

Byelorussian emigration to America is also recorded in the official Russian statistics. However, Byelorussian emigrants are not recorded by their ethnic name, but by their place of origin, the Byelorussian administrative territory. Russian statistical sources reveal that about half a million Byelorussians migrated to America during the period of mass emigration which lasted from the last decade of the 19th century to about 1914-1918. Unfortunately, the Byelorussian presence in America is not apparent because these immigrants were not recorded as Byelorussians in the official statistics. There is also very little about Byelorussians in textbooks and almost no belles-lettres concerning the subject of Byelorussians in America. Surely there must be reasons for this situation. How did such a substantial group of immigrants go unnoticed and unrecorded? One may even pose the rhetorical question "What became of half a million Byelorussians in America? How did they become a "lost colony," and why?

Clearly, such a situation cannot be explained by any one simple answer or reason. There is a series of causes and reasons responsible for the situation.

The Historical Factor

Byelorussia's historical past is complicated by two factors:

terminology and its political situation during the 18th and the 19th centuries when it became a Russian colony through several partitions of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth.

Even to this day only a handful of works have been written which properly explain the real meaning of the terms Rus', Litva, Lithuania, West Russia by which present-day Byelorussia is known in history. The term Byelorussia is of recent origin (it is only about one hundred years old) and present-day Byelorussians were formerly known under a variety of other names.

The Factor of Russification

The second factor is the Muscovite (Great Russian) policies of Russification. After Russia seized all of the Byelorussian territory in 1795, it started to carry out very forceful and well-planned policies of Russification designed to uproot the history of the Empire's western borders in order to make the people entirely Russian and thus secure this part of the Empire. The foundations for such policies were laid down with theoretical concepts such as that Great Russia and its tsars are the collectors of "Russian territories," that the historical term "Rus'" belongs to the former "Muscovite State," that the term "Litva" belongs to the non-Slavic Nation, the Samogitian, and that "Moscow is the Third Rome and there will be no other."

These objectives were achieved by the following means: the only language recognized in the territory was Russian. The only schools were grade schools with a very few high schools in the larger cities; the textbooks were censored and all official statements emphasized that the local language, culture, and customs, etc. were inferior, and that one had better learn the language of the masters and accept their culture in order to get ahead.

The Russian authorities imported a large number of administrators from the central regions of the Muscovite State to carry out these policies through the schools, the administration, and the Orthodox Church. At the same time those authorities promoted the principle that there were no Byelorussians of the Roman Catholic Faith, but only Poles; thus considering (and classifying) all Byelorussians of the Eastern Orthodox faith as Russians. Emigration to Siberia was encouraged by substantial financial rewards. The official name of the territory was changed to the North Western Territory (**Severo-Zapadnyj Kraj**). A British journal analyzing the situation of Byelorussia during that period published the following statement:

The greater part of White Russia has indeed a marshy, damp, or sandy soil, surrounded by primaeval forests which however are rapidly being devastated by a reckless mismanagement meeting with no check from the Governement. The land is divided between the

native population and the polonised proprietors who exploit the labour of the people most unmercifully. Vast tracts of land are in the possession of the Government who allow the same to lie fallow, or divide them amongst Russian colonists without regard to the native White Russians, who are thus compelled to emigrate in numbers to America and Siberia. Hand in hand with all this goes the low educational condition of the people which perhaps has no parallel in the whole of Europe. Hardly 8 to 10 per cent. can read, and only 6-8 per cent. can write. The official education of the people consists in the drilling them into the technicalities of the reading and writing of **Russian**, of the Slavonic ecclesiastical Mass books, in the repeating by heart of the names of all the members of the imperial family, besides some practice in the four rules of arithmetic, and the learning of the principal events of Russian history. Instruction in the State Orthodox religion is also obligatory for the children of Roman Catholics. The scarcity of schools and the miserable character of the instruction given in them leads to this result, that after two or three years' schooling the pupils forgot how to read within a year's time, and of their being able to write there can be no question. The reason for this dismal state of things is to be found in the fact that the instruction is given in the Russian, and not in the native language. Instant dismissal awaits teachers using the White Russian language. No wonder then that under these conditions there is scarcely any advance but the rather a going backwards in the education of the people, that after 30 years of a strenuous Russification 90 per cent. of the White Russian population remain illiterates. All educational and enlightening publications written in the White Russian language are strictly forbidden as those of a revolutionary tendency.

In all Orthodox churches besides the Slavonic ecclesiastical language Russian alone is allowed, whilst formerly the **Uniats** used their own language as well as the Slavonic.

In the zeal of Russification the Government has carried out a root and branch proscription of the White Russian language, extending it not only to the Church, the school, officialdom, and official business relations, but right into the private life of the people. A Ministerial order forbade the use of White Russian in private assemblies, soldiers were not allowed to receive letters from home written in their native language. In the schools the penalty for the use of their mother tongue amongst the pupils was simply expulsion.

The policy of Russification and Orthodoxy does not however confine itself to the stifling of intellectual progress, but penetrates also into the domain of economical and practical life. The educated Roman Catholic White Russians are forbidden to acquire agricultural land in their own country. They are also excluded from the holding of any Government post in their own district, Catholic White Russian peasants are allowed to purchase agricultural land, but only

to the extent of 60 Dessjatinas and only on the condition that they personally cultivate it with their own hands. The Government at every opportunity endeavours to stir up the ill feeling existing between the White Russian peasants and the Polonized White Russian nobility, which ill feeling has increased since the Polish insurrection of 1863. The Orthodox priests, instigated by the Government inflame the people against the educated classes.

Such is the picture of a people living in Europe, in the gloomiest spot of dark Russia. Yet it was these very people who after the subjugation of the Ukraine by the Tartars, and the ruin of the northern Republics by the Muscovites continued from the 16th Century uninterrupted intercourse with Western Europe yea even transplanted the latter's Reform ideas into its own soil. To these people who for long had been a centre of culture for Russia, up to the time of the great Lomonosow, are now denied their most sacred rights. They are kept in the deepest darkness, possessing at present under the iron rule of the White Czars a smaller number of schools than they had in the 16th Century. Indeed, the people of White Russia have been pushed back by the Muscovite régime to three centuries before the 16th Century, so that to-day they exist in purely Middle Age conditions. (1)

These were the conditions in Byelorussia shortly prior to the period of mass emigration. In addition, it must be emphasized that the people inhabiting this part of the Russian Empire did not have an official ethnic name. For officialdom they were the inhabitants of the North Western Territory. They knew "deep in their hearts" that they were not Russians or Poles, and often they called themselves **Licviny** (Lithuanians), but to be on the safe side and keep out of trouble with Russian officialdom, they were always **tutejshyja**, i.e., locals.

Thus, because the terminology was confused, because Byelorussian history was distorted by thousands of pages of Russian and Polish writings, and because the people inhabiting Byelorussia were stripped of their ethnic consciousness when they came to America, they accepted whatever nationality label was given them.

The sociological emigration-immigration process witnessed a mass mislabeling of one nation or another. Byelorussians became Russians or Poles in the midst of acquiring their freedom.

This dark and tragic picture brightens somewhat if we clarify the American understanding of the term "Russian". Undoubtedly many Americans really do not attach an ethnic meaning to the term "Russian". By using this term they mean an administrative unit, a vast Empire with a multitude of peoples. A couple of examples below well illustrate this point of view. But at the core of this confusion lies an unfortunate event, benefiting the Russians, i.e., the Great Russians, at the expense of smaller nations. And here are examples:

"The true Russians are divided into three groups of very unequal size. These are said to differ not only in language, but temperament as well. About fifty of the seventy-odd millions of them, known as Great Russians, occupy the entire center, north, and east of the country. These are the "Muscovites," their historic center being in the ancient capital city of Moscow. Next in numbers come the people of Little Russia, or Ukraine, which, as our maps show, inhabits the governments of the southwest, up against Galicia . . . The third group, known as the White Russians, only four million souls in number, is found in the four governments shown on our maps, extending from Poland up and around Lithuania." (2)

"The Slavic race may be conveniently divided into three great divisions according to their geographical distribution in Europe: an eastern division, embracing all the Russian Slavs; a southern division . . ." (3)

Confusion in Printed Sources

Unfortunately terminological confusion has penetrated English language scholarly literature very deeply, helping to perpetuate the inaccuracies and misinterpretations for generations. Here are some passages from authoritative contemporary reference tools and teaching aids:

(1798):

"The Russian empire is inhabited by no less than 16 different nations, of which our limits will hardly permit us to give the names. The first are the Slavonic nations, comprehending the Russians, who are predominant inhabitants of the whole empire, and the Poles, who besides occupying the countries lately wrested from the republic, live in the governments of Polatsk and Moghilev, as well as in the district of Saleghinsk and along the river Irtish."

"Lithuania, an extensive province of Poland. By the natives it is called Letwa, and has Great Poland and Russia on the west; part of Muscovy on the east; Livonia, the Baltic Sea, and part of Muscovy, on the north; Red Russia, Volhinia, and Podolia on the south, and the Ukraine on the south-east . . . The dialect is a language of the Slavonic; and they speak here, as in Poland, a barbarous kind of Latin. Lithuania is divided into nine palatinates. Another division is into Lithuania properly so called, and Lithuanian Russia. Some also comprehend under it Samogitia and Courland." (4)

(1832): **Russia, Black**; formerly a subdivision of Lithuania, now forming the Russian governments of Minsk and Grodno.

Russia, Great; former name of a province comprising a large part of European Russia, extending from the Frozen ocean to about the middle of the course of the Don . . .

Russia, Little; name of that part of Russia lying south of Great Russia, now forming the governments of Tchernigov, Cherson, Kiev, Ekaterinoslav, and Poltava.

Russia, Red; formerly an independent duchy, which belonged to Poland after 1396, and formed the palatinates of Chelm, Belcz, and Lemberg...

Russia, White, was a part of Lithuania, which now forms the Russian governments of Smolensk, Mohilev, Vitepsk, and a small part of Minsk." (5)

(1875):

Little Russia, or Ukraine, (Kiev, Tchernigov, Poltava, and Kharkov); South Russia or New Russia, comprising Bessarabia, Kherson, Taurida, Yekaterinoslav, and the territory of the Don Cossacks; West Russia, comprising Lithuania, Volhynia, Podolia, (part of Red Russia, the bulk of which is in Galicia), Vitebsk and Mohilev (White Russia), and Minsk (Black Russia)..." (6)

(1877):

"The old names, Great Russia or Muscovy (comprising the whole of the northern and central part of the country), Little Russia or Ukraine (Kiev, Tchernigov, Poltava, and Kharkov), New Russia (Bessarabia, Kherson, Taurida, Yekaterinoslav, and the Don Cossack Territory), Red Russia (Lithuania, Volhynia, Podolia, and parts of the present Galicia), White Russia (Vitebsk and Mohelev), Black Russia or Minsk, and the Baltic provinces (Courland, Livonia, Esthonia and Ingria) have now only an historical significance." (7)

(1892):

"The 95,870,810 Russians who inhabit Europe are divisible into— (1) Great Russians, those who are inhabitants of central Russia. (2) Little Russians, those who are located in the s.w.... (3) White Russians, those living in the western provinces." (8)

(1895):

"The general divisions of Russia, having a well understood significance among the people, are as follows: Great Russia, or Muscovy (comprising the whole of the northern and central part of the country); Little Russia, or Ukraine (Kieff, Chernigov, Poltava, and Kharkoff); New Russia (Bessarabia, Kherson, Taurida, Ekaterinoslaff, and the Don Cossack territory); Red Russia Lithuania, Volhynia, Podolia, and parts of the present Galicia); White Russia (Vitebsk and Moghilev); Black Russia, or Minsk; and the Baltic provinces (Courland, Livonia, St. Petersburg, and Esthonia)... More than 110 nationalities, belonging to the branches and groups of the Mediterranean and Mongolian races, dwell in Russia, and they speak more than forty languages. The Slavs constitute about three-quarters of the entire population, however, and the Russian

people proper about two-thirds of the whole. The smaller and exceedingly antipathetic race, the Poles, form about one-twelfth or one-thirteenth of the whole people, and number approximately 8,500,000. A vigorous national policy has been for many years in operation for the Russianizing of the Poles and also the small non-Slavic elements...

The Russians themselves are subdivided into Great, Little, and White Russians, the first greatly preponderating, and their tongue being the accepted language of the empire and used by the Government and a great majority of the people." (9)

In this last reference the term Russification is already applied, but unfortunately it was not applied to Byelorussians and Ukrainians who were the first victims of the Russification process.

It would, however, be unfair not to mention that in the American political literature, beginning in the last century, voices were raised about the problems and confusion of terminology concerning the Russian empire. A couple of articles will illustrate this:

(1841):

"Rossja is not precisely the same as Rus, although founded on the ruins of the latter. In the west of Europe no distinction is made, and the same name, Russia, is given both to modern Rossja and the ancient Rus, or Russja. Still they should be considered separately; accordingly we shall use the word Ruthenia to designate Rus or Russja ancient or modern, as distinguished from Russia, or Rossja, the autocratic empire founded on the Czarate of Moscow." (10)

(1864):

"The present empire of Alexander is not Russia, but Rossia, and the name of Russia is imposed on Polans near Kiow, on Radymicians near Nowogrodek, on Drewlans south of the river Pripec, etc." (11)

It is evident that the conditions and the climate described above generated the other important factor which contributed to the loss of Byelorussian ethnicity in the process of immigration. That is psychology.

The Psychological Factor

The political situation in Byelorussia under the Russian occupation certainly had great influence on the psychology of the people and, consequently, on the psychology of the immigrants. The ethnic selfconsciousness of the peoples was almost at zero because of Russian colonial policies and the total efforts to destroy and uproot all traces of Byelorussian statehood and history. Thus, the psychology of the immigrant masses was that of slaves who knew that the less they talked the better off they

would be and, they hoped, the sooner they would get their freedom.

Encountering technological advances they never dreamed of before and the abundance of manufactured goods influenced their imaginations and increased the desire to be part of all this as soon as possible. Nothing would stop the immigrant, not even pride in his ethnicity, from being part of the life that he previously had only dreamed about. The presence of officialdom made the immigrant uneasy and more subdued. Thus, in his mind he decided to do everything that the officers said or ordered. It is interesting to note that not only Byelorussian immigrants were afraid of officialdom and thus suppressed their ethnic affiliation. This was also true for other ethnic groups, including the Poles. One Polish scholar reveals that the Poles also hid their ethnicity. So, Stefan Wloszczewski writes:

"As to the degree of national enlightenment, the communities of Polish immigrants in many instances leave much to be desired. The politics of the occupying governments have, in many cases, greatly weakened the feeling of nationalism and instilled in the population the idea that they belong to a neighboring nationality...

Uneducated people who have panicky fear of any kind of written statements, play an important role...

For these two reasons, a large percent of the members of the Polish group in the United States were registered as Russian, German, or Austrian, and thus the statistics are inaccurate and false." (12)

Certainly these statements are entirely applicable to the Byelorussian immigrants also. Fortunately for the Poles, however, in this country they already had hundreds of educated men, especially priests, who later were able to revive Polish consciousness in those "unspecified" or erroneously-labelled immigrants and thus reinclude them in the Polish group. The Byelorussians were not so lucky, and the Byelorussian masses in the United States were assimilated into other groups.

Hand in hand with the psychological factor was the attitude of the immigrants themselves. Granted the difficult circumstances and other historic reasons, the immigrants from Byelorussia, even in the U.S., did not organize, with the exception of a very few places.

They were indifferent towards their native land, they did not have pride in their heritage, and they did not form their own ethnic organizations. But there is no question that they knew who they were. Even though members of Polish and Russian churches, the immigrants from Byelorussia felt that they were different from those parishioners who came for example from Warsaw or the Poznań area. They maintained their own close circles and ties; these, unfortunately, did not help to establish a name for the Byelorussian group in America.

The Attitude of Officials in the Department of Immigration

Although the immigration authorities had a clear picture of Byelorussians, they simply did not count them as a separate group. In their official publication **"Dictionary of Races or Peoples"**, they state the following:

"The White Russian is one of the three distinct branches of the Russian language and race, although of far less importance numerically and politically than either of the other two. (The Great Russian and the Little Russian or Ukrainian, V.K.)

It is as much a "race" as the Great Russian ("Russian") or the Little Russian (Ruthenian), although usually considered simply as Russian in America. Unlike the term "Black Russia," "White Russia" is still found on the ethnographical map. It is a compact but small district roughly corresponding with what is now called "West Russia", though reaching somewhat nearer Moscow on the east... The White Russians constitute over three-fourths of the population of Mogilef and Minsk provinces and about half of Vitebsk, Vilna, and Grodno. In Kovno and Courland they approach the Baltic.

The White Russians have long been in political subjection first to Lithuania, then to Poland, and, finally, to the Great Russians, although their lot now appears preferable to that of all the other subject peoples of western Russia. For this reason, among others, we hear little of them as a distinct race... They are usually considered to be of purer Russian stock than either the Great or the Little Russians. Both the latter are far more modified by Mongolian elements, Finnic and Tataric...

They are... of the purest type of the so-called "Eastern" or "Celts-Slavic" race.

The White Russians number less than 6,000,000 or but little over one-tenth as many as the Great Russians. They are not counted separately as immigrants." (13)

The same document says that the Great Russians emigrate chiefly to Siberia and that they emigrate to America to a smaller degree in proportion to their population than any other Slavic people.

A somewhat similar attitude toward ethnic groups and ethnicity was adopted by the Census Bureau. Here is how Professor Carl Darling Buck saw it in Chicago at the turn of the century:

"The Lithuanians, who in language and sentiment form a distinct people, and are represented by thousands of immigrants, are nowhere mentioned. In Chicago they were told by enumerators that, there being no provision for Lithuanians, they might be either Poles or Russians. Whether in other places they were classified under Poland or Russia, or both, it is impossible to say." (14)

A similar situation existed for other immigrant groups, continued Professor C. D. Buck, and also he added that:

"The newly arrived foreigner, ignorant and knowing yet but little English, vaguely suspects the enumerator of being a constable or a spy, and thinks his safest course is to give false answers".

Together with such official attitudes went the **Russifying policies of the Russian Orthodox Church** to which the majority of the Byelorussian immigrants belonged. For that matter, the **Polish Roman Catholic Church** also simply absorbed and **Polonized** Byelorussian Roman Catholics without any other considerations.

It is interesting to note the fact that the Lithuanian immigrants to the United States, consisting almost one hundred percent of Roman Catholics, concentrated around Polish Roman Catholic Churches and often were the founders of the Churches. The Polish ecclesiastical authorities were satisfied with this situation and were displeased when the action for separation of the Lithuanians from the Polish churches was initiated by Jan Szlupas who arrived in this country in 1885. (15) Over the years the Lithuanians were quite successful in separating their masses from the Poles, thus avoiding the Polonization process and the loss of their Lithuanian heritage. Byelorussians, unfortunately, were unable to do so because they did not have their own Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox clergy at that time.

The Attitude of Other Immigrants from Nations Bordering Byelorussia

Of the neighboring nations only the Ukrainians supported the recognition of Byelorussians and the awakening of the Byelorussian national-ethnic consciousness. Neither the Lithuanians nor the Poles—to say nothing of the Russians—wanted to admit the Byelorussian presence; rather they tried to obscure it by using confusing terminology. Polish literature dealing with immigration in the U.S. either ignored the Byelorussian presence completely or described Byelorussians by using such terms as „North Eastern Poland”, “Poles from the North-Eastern Provinces”, “Russified Poles from the North-Eastern Polish Commonwealth”. Russian literature dealing with East Slavic immigrants in the United States used terminology such as “Russian/Byelorussian”, “Russians from the North-Western Provinces”, “Russian Peasants from the Western Regions”, “Russians of West-Russian Stock”. The Lithuanians played with terminology in the following manner:

"Lithuanians: they are proud of their ancestry and resent being considered Slavs. They claim with pride that most of Poland's great men, Kosciuszko, Chodkiewicz, Sienkewicz and others were Lithuanians." (16)

The selection of these outstanding men by Lithuanians is a gross mistake because all three men were Byelorussians by birth.

Byelorussian themes in novels, short stories and other types of belles-lettres.

These contributed to and perpetuated inaccuracies and injustices to the Byelorussians. To a great extent opinion in America toward Russia was created by authors like Mary Antin, Leon Kobrin, Sholem Yankev Abramovitch (Mendele Moikher Sforim), Morris Vinchevsky and others.

Let us take the writer Mary Antin who was well known and well liked. In her many editions of **From Polotsk to Boston** (17), and **The Promised Land** (18), she throws light on Byelorussia although she always uses the term "Russia". Born and raised in Polotsk, which she seems to have a nostalgic affection for, and knowing that Polotsk, Vitebsk, and Vilna as well, were not exactly Russia, she projects, perhaps unintentionally, the impression that all this is Russia. I fully understand the Jewish soul that suffered so much in the Pale, but one would wish that she who suffered had thought for a minute about the local "dirty" peasants who were suffering also . . . and had mentioned that these peasants were oppressed also . . . and that they were not Russians, but White Russians. The book is an excellent reflection of the life of the Jews in the Pale, on Byelorussian territory, but it creates an inaccurate and incomplete image of Byelorussians.

The American Education System

This system has traditionally been rather insensitive to the ethnic differences among its citizens, a fact reflected in the theory of a melting pot. Certainly the children of those immigrants did not hear in American schools about their parents' nationality; rather they heard about the Russian immigrants, Russian tsars, Russian culture, etc. The concepts as outlined by Dr. Allan McLaughlin certainly did not contribute to unravelling the true picture of the ethnicity of the immigrants.

The Russian Slavs are divided by philologists into three divisions: Great Russians, White Russians, and Little Russians.

The Great Russians occupy a large quadrangular area in Russia consisting of the central governments from Novgorod and Vologda on the north to Kiev on the south; from Pensa and Simbirsk on the east to the Polish provinces on the west.

The White Russians number less than four million and occupy some of the western governments adjoining Poland.

Great Russians and White Russians do not emigrate. Nearly all Russian immigrants come from two Austrian provinces. They are called Little Russians, Russniaks, and Red Russians.

The Slav is popularly supposed to be mentally slow and without energy or ambition. This is not entirely true . . . This seeming mental deficiency and absence of ambition in the Slav is due mainly to lack of education and to centuries of subjection to tyrannical masters. The Slavic immigrant fills a place in the industrial fields of this country in which he hears no call for such attributes as ambition, energy, and mental brilliancy, a place which no American envies him, and where he is as necessary to American advancement as the coal and iron that by his labour are mined and made ready for the American mechanic and manufacturer." (19)

These were some of the factors which contributed to obscuring the Byelorussian presence in America, and made it difficult to find traces of that early presence. It is a necessary task, however, because the Byelorussian historical past has already been stripped and misinterpreted and it is our duty to unravel and preserve that history and heritage wherever possible, the more so since the Russification process is still going on.

Byelorussica in America

What are these traces of an early Byelorussian heritage in America? The confusion concerning Byelorussia in scholarly literature is reflected in the confused state of that heritage in America. It is not the purpose of this presentation to survey the American literature on Byelorussia, but it is an appropriate place to mention that alongside the misinformation there have been numerous reliable articles. For example, **The North American Review**, a widely distributed publication, devoted the following lines to Byelorussia in 1836:

The following little elegy in the White-Russian dialect, we have always considered as one of the gems of poetry. It is a sigh of deep, mourning, everlasting love.

The Dead Love

White art thou, my maiden,
Can'st not whiter be!
Warm my love is, maiden,
Cannot warmer be!

But when dead my maiden,
White was she still more;

And, poor lad, I love her,
Warmer than before. (20)

It is to the credit of American scholarly literature that, as early as 1834, the Byelorussian language was recognized as the language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (21) and it was acknowledged that the Bible in the Byelorussian language was published in Prague at the beginning of the 16th century (21, 22). There were other informative articles about Byelorussia and indications of the Byelorussian presence during the 19th century in America.

It is a well-known fact that throughout the 19th century individuals and groups of Byelorussian immigrants arrived in the United States. Most of them were of the Roman Catholic Faith who had actively fought against Russian occupation and oppression (23). Most of these Byelorussians were under strong Polish cultural influences, but they knew that ethnically they were Byelorussians. The most distinguished Byelorussian of this period, although he gave his entire life to the Polish Nation and fought for the freedom of the Polish Commonwealth, was Thaddeus Kosciuszko. This author does not claim Kosciuszko as a spokesman for Byelorussians but the fact remains that by birth he was a Byelorussian.

Other men from Byelorussia who achieved a certain prominence in American history are: Feliks Miklashkevich, an outstanding figure in the history of the American Navy during the American Revolution, who came from an old noble family in the region of Vitsebsk with collateral lines in the Polatsk region (24); Aleksander Bielaski from the Minsk region (25); several prominent social leaders settled in Illinois (26) and other states. Most of these men were considered to be of Polish heritage because their names sounded Polish, or, as the distinguished American-Polish historian M. Haiman put it "according to all appearances" or "it may be safely assumed" (27). At the same time Haiman said "noble of the north-eastern provinces of Poland" meaning Byelorussian territory. It is certainly a lack of historical rigor to assume a national heritage on the basis of the sound of a name alone. An interesting remark about names and heritage was made by Rev. L. J. Siekaniec, O.F.M. In analyzing the "Polish" colony of Sioux City, Iowa, he writes:

A search of the city directories in the local libraries produced some indications of Polish names in 1883-1884. However, the mutations may be from Polish, or they may be simply Bohemian, or Slovak names, or possibly Russian...

So there is nothing definite about Poles until 1905 (or maybe 1904)...

In 1907 the pioneer families were those of Valentine Pietrucha, Andrew Sobczyk... F. Toczko, Francis Bujarski, A. Pryc... etc.

The Bishop ordered the names to be gathered, i.e., of Poles, and also of Lithuanians and Russians. A census in 1913 showed interesting things as it was noted by the census taker. "He also noted that while there was none on the parish records there were many Russians in the city, mostly Orthodox; in fact, there were more Russians than Poles. However, no one gave the Russians any spiritual attention, and Protestant preachers began to attend them, baptizing their children.

Yet a different document analyzing this so-called "Russian" colony in Sioux City, Iowa states:

The striking feature of this colony is that about eighty per cent of its people came from the former Minsk Gubernia, Slutsk Region, Kapyl county or the town of Kapyl. The first immigrants from that region began to come to Sioux City at the turn of the century. (29)

Thus, these people who for Father Siekaniec were "Russians" were in reality Byelorussians from central Byelorussia. It could well be that many other "Poles" were in fact Byelorussians. Roman Catholic priests from Byelorussia (many of them were only ethnically Byelorussians) played a very important role during the early stages in the development of Catholic education in this country. They were chiefly Jesuits from Polatsk and many of them came here at the invitation of John Carroll, the first Roman Catholic Bishop in the United States. Men like Fathers Kohlman, Norbert Korsak, Boniface Krukowski and others came from Byelorussia and helped to establish Catholic education here. (30)

An historic fact that is often overlooked is that the Jesuits have continuously survived in this country only because they became affiliated with the Byelorussian territory, where the Society was allowed. The American Jesuits not only became affiliated with Byelorussia, but their jurisdiction in the United States became known as the **White Russian Province**. This affiliation was in effect from 1805 to 1814 when the ban against the Jesuits was lifted and they were allowed to form their own administrative units once again. (31)

Symbolically it is certainly noteworthy that Byelorussia played an important part in the life of the Roman Catholic Church in this country.

An outstanding personality of this epoch is Rev. Franciřak Dzierozynski. Father Dzierozynski was born in Orsha, north-east Byelorussia, on January 3, 1779. He studied at the Jesuit college in Orsha and at the age of fifteen, in 1794, he entered the society, "bringing with him an intellect of rare order" (32). He was ordained during the academic year 1808-1809 and was made professor of theology at the college of Polatsk. He also taught at several other schools in Byelorussia (33). Father Dzierozynski arrived in America on August 13, 1823.

The literature about Dzierozynski is abundant and his contribution to American Catholic Education was enormous. This is certainly a topic for a separate paper or even a monograph. (34) What is of special interest to us is Dzierozynski's ethnic background and heritage. Polish scholars consider Dzierozynski a Pole without any hesitation. The facts suggest a different conclusion.

Assigning Polish ethnicity to Father Dzierozynski has no real foundation in facts. He was born and raised in north-eastern Byelorussia, that part of Byelorussia which was never under strong Polish cultural influence. Most of his life as a teacher was spent on Byelorussian territory. He was a very devout Roman Catholic and a devoted member of the Society of Jesus, but some of the facts of his life and his views support the view that he was not Polish.

A well-known historical fact is that the patriotic Polish intelligentsia, including the clergy, impatiently awaited the arrival of Napoleon, thinking that Poland would be rebuilt. Father Dzierozynski apparently did not share this view. Instead of waiting for Napoleon, he purchased horses and carriages and went to the town of Vialikia Luki in the North. He returned to Polatsk only after Napoleon's retreat. A scholar who has worked on Father Dzierozynski's biography, Rev. F. Domański, in studying Dzierozynski's Diary concerning this period writes: "Apparently Rev. Dzierozynski was not interested in politics. Although these times were so important and exciting, Rev. Dzierozynski's Diary made not a single reference to the Polish subject" (34a). Such an attitude is perfectly understandable for a person who was not Polish; this strongly suggests that Dzierozynski was not a Pole but a Byelorussian. For Polish scholar, Rev. F. Domański it is hard to understand that the sister of such a prominent Jesuit could marry a schismatic, an Orthodox Christian (34b).

Along the same lines as the previous reasoning, it is Dzierozynski's typical Byelorussian tolerance that makes him differ in this attitude from the Poles. His acceptance of the marriage of his sister to an Eastern Orthodox believer is a typical Byelorussian characteristic. Father Dzierozynski maintained close relations with his countrymen around the world, giving special attention to the arriving insurgents who had been born in Byelorussia (34c). All these facts allow one to draw the conclusion that Rev. Franciszek Dzierozynski knew of his Byelorussian origin and was never a Pole in thinking or attitudes. Having assessed the political situation as one about which he could not do very much, he decided to stay out of politics. He was in many ways a very typical Byelorussian and a very loyal Roman Catholic, who, with his intellectual acumen, saw a very dark picture of Byelorussia, and devoted his time to the service of his Lord.

There were other concrete indications of the Byelorussian presence in America. As for example, a store-front advertisement

of a grocery store in Connecticut, where the owner offered discounts to his countrymen born in the Mogilev region of Byelorussia. (35)

A substantial amount of information about Byelorussians appeared in the Russian-language literature devoted to life in America. One of the first rather extensive surveys of the so-called Russian colony in the United States was done by E. N. Matrosov and published in 1897 (36). This Russian author said the following about New York City:

"The Russians from Russia (as opposed to those from Galicia and Hungary, V. K.) are only a drop in the bucket, literally, because they numbered about 150 persons, which is nothing in a city of three million, and these are primarily Orthodox Byelorussians from the Minsk and adjoining regions. They were chiefly tailors, smiths, and shoemakers, the latter being the majority."

The author, in describing Ellis Island, clearly gives the picture that the question of nationality was not the main object here, and that very curious situations often developed. He states that "in general, there are no statistics by nationalities at all". Mr. Matrosov describes Byelorussians in his work, showing that he understands the problems of Byelorussians and their ethnic awareness. In describing the restaurant downtown called the Chopin Restaurant, "which in itself reveals the presence of Slavs", Mr. Matrosov says that the restaurant was founded and owned by a "Polonized Byelorussian from the Minsk Region".

Another author, Mr. I.P. Sysoyev, makes the following remark about the so-called Russian immigration to the United States:

"Russians, i.e., Great Russians from Nizhnegorod and the Jaroslavl regions, in the United States are only very few. The Russians in the United States are predominantly from the Western Region: the regions of Mogilev and Minsk. There are also very many Jews". (37)

To the number of Byelorussians in America at an early date one can definitely assign the activities of Dr. Nicholas Sudziloŭski-Russell, who, before settling in Hawaii, was quite active in California. (38)

Another interesting fact related to Byelorussia is the project of an agricultural colony in Kansas. The origins of this socialist colony go back to a group formed in Kiev in 1871 which called itself "Americans". (38a) This group planned to form a commune of immigrants from the Russian Empire which would exemplify the ideal socialist society. Students of Kiev University formed the core of the group and Nicholas Sudziloŭski-Russell played an important role in organizing the group and financing it through Byelorussian channels.

An interesting remark was made by Mr. P.A. Tverskoi as to the number of genuine Russians in the midwest. In a superior, scornful attitude toward the uneducated peasants working in Chicago as carpenters at the construction of the Russian World's Fair Pavilion, Mr. Tverskoi states that "he was not able to find one genuine Great Russian and have a talk with him". (39)

Although Byelorussians were not reflected in the statistical American data, and there was much confusion about them and their country, references to Byelorussians, as an immigrant group, in the descriptive type of literature are abundant. Further research will reveal more specific facts and manifestations of Byelorussians in America during the 19th century, the darkest period in Byelorussian history, and it will be possible to "revive and restore the Byelorussian lost colony" and the Byelorussian heritage in the United States.

NOTES

- 1 Palisander, Heb. "The White Russians. A nation driven back into the Middle Ages under Muscovite rule."
(**The Anglo-Russian**, London, vol. VIII(6), December, 1904. p. 875-876.
- 2 Ripley, William Z.
"The racial geography of Europe."
(**Popular Science Monthly**, October, 1898, p. 724).
- 3 McLaughlin, Allan
"The Slavic immigrant."
(**Popular Science Monthly**, May to October, 1903, p. 25).
- 4 **Encyclopaedia or a Dictionary of Arts & Sciences...**
Philadelphia, Thomas Dobson, vol. 10, 1798, p. 102; vol. 16, 1798, p. 570.
- 5 **Encyclopaedia Americana.**
Philadelphia, Carey and Lea, vol. XI, 1832, p. 150.
- 6 **The American Cyclopaedia.**
New York, D. Appleton, vol. 14, 1875, p. 480.
- 7 **Johnson's New Universal Cyclopaedia.**
New York, 1877, p. 1749.
- 8 **The International Cyclopaedia.**
New York, Dodd..., vol. 12, 1892. p. 832.
- 9 **Johnson's Universal Cyclopaedia.**
New York, D. Appleton, vol. VII, 1895, p. 215.
- 10 Kalussowski, Henry Dowoyna
"The Slavs and their Literature,"
(**The American Eclectic**, November, 1841, p. 563).
- 11 "Tardy Truths,"
(**The Continental Monthly**, July-December, 1864, p. 217).
- 12 Wloszczewski, Stefan
History of Polish American Culture.
Trenton, White Eagle Publishing Co., 1946, p. 43.

- 13 **Dictionary of Races or Peoples. Reports of the Immigration Commission.** Senate: 61st Congress, 3d Session, Document no. 662.
Washington, GPO, 1911, p. 113-114.
- 14 Buck, Carl Darling
A Sketch of the Linguistic Conditions of Chicago.
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, The Decennial Publications,
First Series, vol. VI, 1904, p. 6, 7.
- 15 Kruszką, Wacław X.
Historia Polska w Ameryce.
Milwaukee, Wis., Spółka Wydaw. Kuryera, tom XII, 1908, p. 67-68.
- 16 McLaughlin, Allan
"The Bright Side of Russian Immigration,"
(**Popular Science Monthly**, November 1903. p. 68-70).
- 17 Antin, Mary
From Polotzk to Boston.
Boston, Mass., W.B. Clarke & Co., 1899. 80 p.
- 18 Antin, Mary
The Promised Land.
Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1912. 373 p.
- 19 McLaughlin, Allan
"The Slavic immigrant,"
(**Popular Science Monthly**, May to October, 1903. p. 30).
- 20 **The North American Review**, Boston, vol. XLIII, 1836, p. 111.
- 21 Robinson, Edward
Biblical Repository.
New York, Leavitt, Lord and Co., 1834. vol. 4, nos. XIII-XVI, p. 356.
- 22 **Historical View of the Languages and Literature of the Slavic Nations.**
By Talvi, pseud.; with a preface by Edward Robinson.
New York, George P. Putnam, 1850. p. 51, 59.
- 23 **The Polish Exile . . .**
Edinburgh, 1833. p. 40-41, 47-48.
- 24 Haiman, Mieczysław
Poland and the American Revolutionary War.
Chicago, Ill., Polish Roman Catholic Union, 1932. p. 69, 70 ff.
- 25 Wytrwał, Joseph A.
"Lincoln's friend-Captain A. Bielaski,"
(**Polish American Studies**, vol. XIV(3-4), July-Dec., 1957. p. 65).
- 26 Rawlings, Isaac D., Mrs.
"Polish exiles in Illinois,"
(**Illinois, State Historical Society, Transactions**, 1927. p. 87).
- 27 Haiman, M. op. cit., ref. 24, p. 106.
- 28 Siekaniec, L.J., Rev., O.F.M.
"The Polish colony of Sioux City, Iowa,"
(**Polish American Studies**, vol. IX(1-2), Jan.-June, 1952. p. 24, 25).
- 29 Bagramov, L.A.
Immigranty v SShA.
Moskva, Izd-vo IMO, 1957. p. 101.

- 30 Haiman, Miecislaus
Polish Past in America. 1608-1865.
 Chicago, Ill., The Polish Roman Catholic Union, 1939. p. 65-68.
- 32 Rutkowska, Neomisla M., Sister H.F.N.
 "A Polish Pioneer Jesuit in America,"
 (**Polish American Studies**, vol. III(3-4), July-Dec., 1946. p. 98, 99).
- 33 I.G.
Materyały do dziejów Akademii Połockiej . . .
 Kraków, 1905. 288 p.
- 34 Domański, Franciszek, Ks. T.J.
 "Patriarcha amerykańskich Jezuitów."
 In: **Sacrum Poloniae Millennium.**
 Rzym, 1960. vol. VII, p. 459-530.
 a. p. 471: "W tak gorących czasach nie zapisał ani jednej refleksji na tematy polskie, nie ujawnił jakiegokolwiek zainteresowania się wojną."
 b. p. 462: "Jaka była reakcja O. Dzierozynskiego na wiadomość, że dwie jego siostry wyszły za mąż za Rosjan, najprawdopodobniej za schizmatyków, nie wiemy. . . przypuszczenia, że O. Dzierozynski może i ostro reago- wał na mieszane małżeństwa swych sióstr."
 c. p. 520-522.
- 35 Kruszką, Wacław X.
Historia Polska w Ameryce.
 Milwaukee, Wis., Spółka Wydaw. Kuryera, tom. III, 1905. p. 91.
- 36 Matrosov, E.N.
Zaokeanskaia Rus'.
 (Istoricheskii Vestnik, St. Petersburg, vol. LXVII, 1897. p. 134, 154-157, 159).
- 37 Sysoyev, I.P.
Puteshestvie v Ameriku.
 Moskva, Tip. Poplavskogo, 1910. p. 74-75.
- 38 Iosko, M.I.
Nikolai Sudzilovskii-Russell.
 Minsk, BGU, 1976. 334 p.
- 38a. p. 26-27.
- 39 Tverskoi, P.A.
Ocherki Severnoj Ameriki Soedinenych Shtatov.
 St. Petersburg, 1895. p. 427-428.

SOVIET DOCUMENTATION OF BYELORUSSIA'S HISTORY (1902-1919)

Jan Zaprudnik
The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences

This paper discusses the way in which the history of the formative period of Byelorussian statehood, 1902-1919, has been documented in Soviet scholarship and describes briefly the thematic unevenness of the documentary volumes published in Minsk in the post-WW II years.

Because we are dealing with political history, let us define at the outset the essence and the main thrust of historical development in Byelorussia during the first two decades of this century in order to establish general criteria by which the relative importance of documents will be judged.

The transformation of the Russian imperial monarchy into a socialist federation, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, has been one of the most momentous events of the 20th century. The historical events in Byelorussia, beginning with 1902, were an important factor in that process. Late in that year the Byelorussian Revolutionary Hramada (originally called the Byelorussian Revolutionary Party) was founded, the principal political organization spearheading the movement toward self-determination of Byelorussia, or Severo-Zapadnyi Kray, as the country was officially referred to in an attempt to prevent separatist tendencies.

In 1903, Hramada's programmatic character was somewhat moderated — and clarified — by substituting "Socialist" for "Revolutionary" in its name. During the next fifteen years the Byelorussian Socialist Hramada (BSH) was the main harbinger and exponent of the idea of the national rebirth of the Byelorussians. These efforts culminated on March 25, 1918, when the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, acting in the name of the All-Byelorussian Congress of December 1917, proclaimed Byelorussia's independence.

The symbolism of this act was not lost on Lenin's Bolshevik Party and its approach to the nationality problem in Byelorussia: the Sixth Conference of the Russian Communist Party (of Bol-

sheviks) of the Severo-Zapadnyi Kray in Smolensk on December 30, 1918, renamed itself the First Congress of the Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) of Byelorussia, and on January 1, 1919, proclaimed the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. The proclamation of the BSSR climaxed an historical process among the Byelorussians whose national awareness and political aspirations were nurtured and expressed first of all in their culture.

From its inception the Byelorussian Socialist Hramada was very much concerned, in addition to social and economic problems, with cultural matters, primarily educational, literary, and linguistic. The cultural, economic, and political aspects of the Byelorussian movement were inextricably interwoven by the nature of social and national relationships: the Byelorussian peasantry who constituted the bulk of the Byelorussian people, were dominated by either Russian or Polish landlords (the fact that many of them were of local genealogy, simply Russianized or Polonized, did not diminish national antagonisms). In order to establish itself any Byelorussian political movement had, therefore, to include, besides all other economic and social issues, a cultural program as well, for it was culture, especially language, that set the Byelorussians apart from their Slavic neighbors to the East and West — the Russians and the Poles, respectively. The Byelorussian language which had been impaired in its development by decades of tsarist prohibition (partially lifted in 1905), became a symbol and an instrument of political, and indeed, national action. The renaissance of the native language and literature had even deeper programmatic meaning because the socially oppressed were also culturally discriminated against. Thus, the struggle for social justice and cultural rights was but one.

It is self-evident, therefore, that any balanced documentation of the period should also reflect these cultural concerns of the Byelorussians — something that Soviet documentary volumes do not do.

The Soviet policy of documentation has been perpetrating a fundamental distortion of the past by the systematic omission of cultural evidential sources. This truncation of historiography at its foundation is reflected, naturally, in the monographic "superstructure" where emphasis is laid on political, military, and economic aspects at considerable expense of cultural history. The latter, however, is indispensable for a proper understanding of the origins of modern Byelorussian nationhood.

Disregard for cultural documentary evidence is vividly displayed in the 745-page volume. *Revolutsionnoye dvizheniye v Belorussii, 1905-1907 gg.* (Minsk, 1955). Among the 610 documents not a single one is in Byelorussian nor does any touch upon aspects of Byelorussian culture.

It was not, however, for lack of significant events in those

two eventful years that the volume is silent. For example, at the beginning of 1906, the second congress of the Byelorussian Socialist Hramada adopted its official platform. A series of important declarations and articles on the needs of the Byelorussians was published in the newspapers *Naša Dola* and *Naša Niva*, the unofficial organs of the BSH. Among their authors were such major movers of the Byelorussian cause as Janka Kupała, Jakub Kołas, Ciotka, and others now considered in Soviet Byelorussia to be classical writers of the national literature.

In 1906, two Byelorussian publishing cooperatives were founded in Vilnia and St. Petersburg.

In May 1907, the Byelorussian Teachers' Union was established at a congress held in Vilnia. One of Union's goals was the introduction of the Byelorussian language into the schools.¹

The nationality problem in Severo-Zapadnyi Kray (Byelorussia) during those two years was hotly debated on the pages of the Russian-language monarchist weekly, *Okrainy Rossii*, published in St. Petersburg.

However, none of these events — some of them clearly revolutionary — was deemed important enough to be included by the editors of *Revolutsionnoye dvizheniye v Belorussii, 1905-1907 gg.* Meanwhile the "Introduction" of the book begins with the following statement:

Documents and materials of the present volume illuminate the struggle of the Byelorussian people for their social and national (emphasis added — J.Z.) liberation during the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907.²

The volume is, nevertheless, filled exclusively with testimony by or about Russian organizations and groups in Byelorussia with their exclusively Russian and centrist mentality.

Another example of this expurgation of evidence is the volume *Dokumenty i materialy po istorii Belorussii (1900-1917 gg.)*. Although its editors admit that "the volume does not claim full elucidation of all questions,"³ their disregard for Byelorussian cultural matters is blatant. Out of the 1199 documents (894 pages of text) only 42 documents (53 pages of text) are devoted to "Education in Byelorussia at the beginning of the 20th century." And even here not a single document is in Byelorussian or pertains to problems of Byelorussian education. According to the volume's "Foreword," "the book also includes some material published in the bourgeois press," but none of the Byelorussian "bourgeois" publications, of which there were several by 1917, is cited.

Evidential sources of the Byelorussian past are cut off not only, as it were, by thematic scissors but by geographic, too.

Nothing illustrates this better than document #399 in the volume (pp. 305-309) entitled "Periodical Publications in Byelorussia's Cities, 1901-1916."

Periodical publications are, of course, a very important source for both Bolshevik and non-Bolshevik aspects of Byelorussian history regardless of where they appeared. But document #399 lists only those that were published in what is today the Byelorussian SSR. For historical reasons, however, some cities outside the BSSR such as Vilnia and St. Petersburg/Petrograd, played an important role in the Byelorussian national movement. For example, in Vilnia — the historical center of Byelorussian cultural activity — not only did the first legal Byelorussian newspaper, *Naša Dola*, see the light of day in 1906, but a whole series of publications followed: *Naša Niva* (1906-1915), *Sacha* (1912-1914), *Bielarús* (1913-1915), *Homan* (1916-1918). In St. Petersburg four issues of the Byelorussian literary journal, *Maładaja Bielaruś*, were published in 1912-1913. All these publications carried many programmatic pronouncements and declarations as well as factual reports that constitute today prima facie evidence for the study of the period. Alas, all of them are ignored by the Soviet compilers of these documentary sources. They have been "exterritorialized," so to speak, from the national past.

Byelorussian life beyond the borders of the BSSR remains, however, an extremely important element of the whole, especially for the war years, 1914-1918, when, as a result of the scorched-earth tactics of the retreating tsarist armies and later of the devastation of the Civil War, one-and-a-half million local inhabitants found themselves evacuated deep into Russia. It was there that much political and cultural activity took place and was recorded in scattered Byelorussian and Russian publications outside the present Byelorussian Republic. Such sources of *dakumenty i matarjaly* have been totally ignored until now.

It should be kept in mind that the Byelorussians' road to statehood was full of hurdles because of the following:

1. The presence in Byelorussia, ravaged and divided by the Russo-German front line, of hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers, unfamiliar with or unsympathetic to Byelorussian national aspirations. When the war broke out in August of 1914, the city of Minsk, for example, was immediately turned into a virtual military garrison with all the usual consequences for freedom of expression.

2. The absence from Byelorussia of much of its intelligentsia and leaders of the national renaissance, because of both the military draft and the massive evacuation of civilians before the onslaught of German troops.

In spite of such unfavorable circumstances brought about by the war, the Byelorussian national movement exerted consider-

able influence on the Bolshevik handling of the Byelorussian "question" — something which is reflected in Soviet phraseology, but without any concomitant substantiation in documentary volumes.

Vadzim Krutalevič, in his detailed study of the period preceding the proclamation on January 1, 1919, of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, notes:

In the struggle against the nationalist counterrevolution and the German occupiers the idea of establishing national statehood on the Soviet basis had been growing stronger in the consciousness of Byelorussian toilers.⁴

Very few documents, however, have been published which reflect the nature of "the nationalist counterrevolution." Discussing forces and factors that led to the establishment of the BSSR, Krutalevič admits the lack of studies on the crucial question:

But how did the form of national statehood originate, what conditioned it, how did the idea of national self-determination spring up among the people? These aspects have been insufficiently studied.⁵

Krutalevič contributed in an outstanding manner by his two-part monograph, *Rozhdeniye Belorusskoy Sovetskoy Respubliki*,⁶ to the illumination of the Soviet version of the story. His copious footnotes reveal, nonetheless, the total lack of published documents on the subject-matter he describes and discusses; his monograph is based exclusively on archival sources whenever he deals — as he does extensively — with the "bourgeois" aspects of events.

The Soviet Byelorussian state, which grew out of a polycentric class struggle and multinational cultural processes (Byelorussian, Jewish, Polish, and Russian), is explained now in purely Marxian terms with disregard of the cultural grain of history. One of the goals of this peculiar but conscious historiographic distortion is to deemphasize cultural history as much as possible for both historical reasons (there is not much for the Bolsheviks to boast of) and political (building a new "historic community," the Soviet People, is easier without too much reference to any non-Russian cultural past).

This biased approach to the contents of the archives also has its theoretical and philosophical underpinnings. Soviet Marxism-Leninism, first of all, is not compunctious about "bourgeois" impartiality in studying the past with its urgings to hear the other side to a dispute. "The Soviet study of sources," explains *Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya*, departs from the tenet

that "the social consciousness is conditioned by social relations and that reflection of historical reality in sources depends on class, political, and other interests of the people who created those sources." The publication policy in the field of documents, therefore, is not to present the views of the class and political enemies who created those documents.

This class struggle by retroaction does not allow bygones to be bygones: the dead foe is kept silent, only the ally is resurrected and given the assignment to fight new battles for the living rulers. Totalitarianism has both dimensions, spatial and chronological.

To preserve the appearance of scholarship and objectivity Soviet theory on the documentary basis of historiography is marked by a dialectical double-talk showing historical scholarship to be the Cinderella of politics. Here is an example taken from the only treatise on the subject published in Soviet Byelorussia:

It is inadmissible to use documentary material for selecting facts in order to satisfy so-called necessity or expediency, or applying contemporary values to the past. At the same time one cannot, under the subterfuge of serving "Mother Truth" or "objectivity," drag into the light each fact from the past of our state which **might denigrate its history** (emphasis added — J.Z.).⁸

Those who might cross this delicate and constantly shifting line between "admissible" and "denigrating" facts, are reminded now and then of Lenin's locution that the publishing of documents is "propaganda not by words, but by deeds,"⁹ or, as Pokrovsky, one of the founding fathers of Soviet historical scholarship, said in the year of Lenin's death (1924): "Archival work is a purely Marxist work, and for Party comrades — purely Party work."¹⁰

Archives in the Soviet Union are, of course, solidly in the hands of the Party.

On the other hand, to prevent anyone from being carried away by Lenin's insistence that all the facts be considered when one tries to investigate the past,¹¹ there are manuals which "explain" the essence of Leninism in the handling of documents:

In the work of facilitating the use of documentary material one has to pose the question in such a way that each document, each fact extracted from archives, and each publication of documents strikes against our ideological foes, (that each) participates in confirming Marxism-Leninism, and this struggle should not be of a defensive, but of an offensive character.¹²

One of the "offensive" weapons of *partiynost'* in historical scholarship, paradoxical as it seems, is silence, turning events into non-events, persons into non-persons, and documents into dead pieces of paper buried in archival vaults.

This method of silencing the past is resorted to for epistemological reasons. Historical facts kept in archives cannot disturb minds. But once they leave their dusty depository and acquire the form of published documents they may become "independent" of their publishers and even interpreters, as Mikoła Ułaśczyk, the Soviet Byelorussian historian, aptly observed in his fundamental study of tsarist archeography:

Published documents have a life of their own, often confirming things quite different from those intended by their compilers and editors when they prepared the volume for publication.¹³

What Ułaśczyk said is further explained by a philosopher:

The "historical fact" is a "knot," or a "fragment," or a "link" of objective reality, independent in its being and significance of the subject who studies it — an authentic foundation of historical knowledge, a point of departure — the validity of a scientific social theory.¹⁴

To prevent certain historical facts from becoming "links" of objective reality, independent in their significance of the subject who studies them, the Party has deprived researchers and readers not only of documents about Byelorussia's past, but also of general histories which discuss culture, especially the more authoritative ones. For example, in 1967, the year of the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, a magisterial collective volume, *Pobeda Sovetskoy vlasti v Belorussii*, was published under the aegis of the Academy of Sciences of the BSSR — the most complete general study of the events that led to the triumph of the Soviet regime in Byelorussia. "This book," wrote Vadzim Krutalevič, reviewing the historiographic horizon in his own monograph, *Rozhdeniye Belorusskoy Sovetskoy Respubliki*, "constitutes the final result of almost fifty years of studying the problem." Krutalevič, however, could not help remarking:

One of the monograph's weak spots is the fragmented manner in which it elucidates the nationality question. The distinct traits of the national movement in Byelorussia have been left unrevealed.¹⁵

Krutalevič in his monograph tried to amplify "the weak spot" he had pointed out, but obviously without success. As one

of Krutalevič's reviewers observed, the author "should have elucidated more thoroughly the national movement in Byelorussia after the February bourgeois-democratic revolution."¹⁶

Krutalevič's failure can be explained partially by the lack of necessary **published** documentation. Documents are not published, in addition to the reasons already mentioned, because publication entails a sort of official sanction for their wide public usage and makes them easy to use given their indexes and annotations, which is not desired by a regime intent upon the amalgamation of the nationalities of the USSR into one "Soviet people."

It is significant that Soviet Byelorussia with her rich cultural past, her Academy of Sciences, and nearly one thousand trained historians, has no published history of Byelorussian culture. The limited number of monographs on various aspects of **cultural** history (literature, architecture, ethnography, etc.) only underscores the direct link between the cultural and political development of Byelorussia.

As to the notion of modern statehood itself, it grew more out of cultural processes than the class struggle. For if it were a matter of the class struggle alone, Byelorussia today would constitute merely a couple of **oblasts** within the Russian Federative Republic and would never have become what she is, a nominally sovereign state.

The cultural history of Byelorussia impacted profoundly upon its political development, and some Soviet historians admit as much. "All the Byelorussian progressive writers of the pre-October era," says one of them, "were militant writers. They were both creators and propagators of progressive ideas, leaders of their nation . . . Even to write in Byelorussian was a heroic feat."¹⁷ The same author, speaking of Byelorussian students in St. Petersburg at the end of the 19th century, observes that their "educational tasks gradually merged with political demands."¹⁸ To take another example, the literary and scientific society of Byelorussian language into the educational system, development other topics with the following basic theme: "The Development of the Byelorussian National Idea."¹⁹

Byelorussianhood itself was primarily a cultural phenomenon. To be Byelorussian was to speak the language, to have an awareness of ethnic distinctiveness and of a separate historical past. (After all, Byelorussia was incorporated into the Russian empire only in the last quarter of the 18th century). Out of this awareness came efforts of a political nature: introduction of the Byelorussian language into the educational system, development of literature, publication of books and periodicals and, gradually, demands for autonomy or independence.

Consistent resistance to these strivings on the part of the tsarist bureaucracy and indifference or even hostility by the decisive majority of the Russian political parties active in Byelorussia, including Lenin's Social Democrats (Bolsheviks), reinforced the conviction among Byelorussians that only by political action would they secure their cultural needs together with social justice.

Naturally, questions of land hunger, agricultural reforms, social relationships, and national minorities' rights were very much on the agenda of the Byelorussian national movement. However, its essential characteristic, the element which set this movement apart from the other two major forces — the Russian and Polish national causes — was culture. Where cultural distinctions were obliterated Byelorussians considered themselves either Russians or Poles, or an amorphous mass of *tutejšyja* ("the natives").

Understanding and appreciation of this basic feature of the historical process in Byelorussia was very much in evidence, both in documentary and interpretative literature, during the liberal 1920's. But the nationality policy of the Soviet central government then was quite different from what we have seen during the Stalin era and that of his successors. The historiography of the 1920's was not so tightly interwoven with the Kremlin's effort to merge the non-Russian nationalities into one "Soviet people."

Today, Soviet historical writings of the NEP period are re-interpreted to fit the current nationality policy of the central government. Vadzim Krutalevič in his monograph, *Rozhdeniye Belorusskoy Sovetskoy Respubliki*, in reviewing the historiography of the 1920's, faults every author who wrote about the Revolution in Byelorussia (most of them, we should remember, were active participants in the formation of Byelorussian statehood and had a first-hand knowledge of events).

Thus, according to Krutalevič, E. Kančer, the author of the book, *Belorusskiy vopros* (Petrograd, 1919), was guided by an "erroneous" thesis that "in Russia (in 1917) there was a national rather than class struggle." The "theoretically deficient" articles by Z. Žyžunovič in *Polymia* (1924-1928) "were devoted to the history of the national movement." The authors of the volume of articles by prominent leaders of the Byelorussian movement, *Bielarús* (Minsk, 1924), followed, according to Krutalevič, the erroneous assumption that "the national renaissance was closely connected with the Byelorussian national-revolutionary movement." Aleś Čarviakoŭ in his book, *Za Savieckuju Bielaruś* (Minsk, 1925), mistakenly concluded that "the main point in the struggle between the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces for the future paths of the Revolution was the nationality question." H. Parečyn also "erred" by explaining that the pro-

clamation of the BSSR was a tactical move by the Bolsheviks in their combatting the counter-revolution and by adopting "uncritically the thesis of Čarviakoŭ that the main point in the struggle in Byelorussia was the nationality question."²⁰

This was not so, maintains Krutalevič in 1975, employing his "re-interpretation" of the past to support the current program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to forge the USSR's nationalities into one "single Soviet people." Nevertheless, he admits: "Byelorussians as a whole were conscious of their independent national standing and originality (*samobytnost'*)."²¹ Krutalevič points out that in a number of Byelorussian cities newspapers and magazines appeared, most of them in Byelorussian, a few in Russian: in Minsk *Volnaja Bielaruś, Belorusskaya Zemlya, Bielaruski šlach, Krynica, Varta*; in Vilnia *Homan, Kryvičanin, Bielaruski Ilustravany Časopis*; in Kiev *Belorusskoye Ekho*; in Slutsk *Rodny Kraj*.²² One should assume that they must contain at least some reflection of that "independent national standing and *samobytnost'*." However, none of them has been used by Soviet publishers as a source of *dokumenty i matarjały*.

Through the prism of those volumes that purport to represent the 17 prerevolutionary years in the lives of the Byelorussians²³ the latter look indistinguishable from the Russians, without much concern for their own historical, cultural, and political values, and lacking any trace of that awareness of which Vadzim Krutalevič speaks.

Krutalevič meanwhile, by raising the question of the insufficient study of the history of the idea of Byelorussian statehood, has raised the question of documenting such studies. It is doubtful, however, that much will be done along these lines because the Communist Party is not committed to "artificially fanning national distinctions." It is clear that only interest from the outside world could, perhaps, wrest out of limbo some of the rich documentary evidence of Byelorussia's past in order to trace properly the ideological genealogy of Byelorussian statehood.

Krutalevič himself has testified to the importance of external Byelorussology: "The contemporary ideological struggle," he has warned, "requires heightened attention by historians to national relations in our country. It generates an acute interest in past events and processes which previously would have attracted historians to a lesser degree than now. The history of the October Revolution and the Civil War in Byelorussia provides exceptionally vivid and convincing material which unmasks the fantasies of falsifiers."²⁴

Indeed, it does. The more documents on cultural history that are unearthed and taken into consideration, the more obvious becomes the imbalance of Soviet Byelorussian historiography of the 1902-1919 period.

We cannot help reminding the Soviet editors and publishers of documentary sources of Lenin's good advice for studying the past:

We must take not individual facts, but the sum total of facts, without a single exception, relating to the question under discussion. Otherwise there will be the inevitable, and fully justified, suspicion that the facts were selected or compiled arbitrarily, that instead of historical phenomena being presented in objective interconnection and interdependence and treated as a whole, we are presenting a "subjective" concoction to justify what might prove to be a dirty business. This does happen . . . and more often than one might think.²⁵

Soviet Byelorussian historians have certainly proven Lenin right by the way they have treated the 1902-1919 period.

NOTES

AN BSSR. Instytut historyji. **Historyja Bielaruskaj SSR**, v. 2, Minsk, 1972, pp. 420-424.

² Institut istorii Akademii nauk BSSR. Arkhivnoye upravleniye BSSR. **Revolutsionnoye dvizheniye v Belorussii 1905-1907 gg.. Dokumenty i materialy**. Minsk, 1955, p. 3.

³ Akademiya nauk Belorusskoy SSR. Institut istorii. **Dokumenty i materialy po istorii Belorussii (1900-1917 gg.)**, v. 3, Minsk, 1953, p. 4.

⁴ V. A. Krutalevich, **Rozhdeniye Belorusskoy Respubliki (Na puti k provozglosheniyu Respubliki. Oktyabr' 1917 — dekabr' 1918 g.)**, Minsk: "Nauka i tekhnika," 1975, p. 31.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁶ The second volume appeared in 1979.

⁷ **Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Entsiklopediya**, v. 6, Moscow, 1965, p. 593.

⁸ Ye. F. Shorokhov, "Ispolzovaniye dokumentalnykh materialov v ideologicheskoy rabote," in: **Voprosy arkhivedeniya i istochnikovedeniya v BSSR**, Minsk, 1971, p. 45.

⁹ Ye. F. Shorokhov, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ See note 25.

¹² Ye. F. Shorokhov, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

¹³ N. Ulashchik, **Ocherki po arkheografii i istochnikovedeniyu istorii Belorussii feodalnogo perioda**, Moscow: "Nauka" publishers, 1973, p. 15

¹⁴ M. A. Barg, **Istoricheskiy fakt: struktura, forma, sodержaniye**, **Istoriya SSSR**, 1976, No. 6, p. 61.

¹⁵ V. A. Krutalevich, *op. cit.*, v. 1, p. 17,

¹⁶ **Kommunist Belorussii**, Minsk, 1976, No. 1, p. 89.

¹⁷ R. M. Siemaškievič, **Bielaruski litaraturna-hramadzki ruch u Pieciarburzie**, Minsk, 1971. p. 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

²⁰ V. A. Krutalevich, *op. cit.*, v. 1, pp. 6-10, *passim*:

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 217.

²³ **Krakh nemetskoy okupatsii v Belorussii v 1918 godu. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov Partarkhiva TsK KP(b) Belorussii**, Minsk, 1947; **Iz istorii ustanovleniya sovetskoy vlasti v Belorussii i obrazovaniya BSSR. Dokumenty i materialy po istorii Belorussii**, vol. IV, Minsk, 1954; **Velikaya Oktyabr'skaya revolutsia v Belorussii. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov**, vols, 1 and 2, Minsk, 1957; **Komitety bednoty Belorussii. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov**, Minsk, 1958; **Revolutsionnyie komitety BSSR (noyabr' 1918 — iyun' 1920). Sbornik dokumentov i materialov**, Minsk, 1961; **Bor'ba za Sovetskuyu vlast' v Belorussii (fevral' 1918 — fevral' 1919 g.). Sbornik dokumentov i materialov v dvukh tomakh**, vol. 1, Minsk, 1968; **Ris'ma trudyashchikhsya Belorussii V. I. Leninu. 1917-1924 gg.**, Minsk, 1969.

²⁴ V. A. Krutalevich, *op. cit.*, v. 1, p. 27:

²⁵ V. I. Lenin, "Statistics and Sociology," **Collected Works**, v. 23, Moscow, 1964, pp. 272-273 (emphasized by Lenin himself).

ORTHODOXY IN BYELORUSSIA: 1917-1980*

Thomas E. Bird
Queens College, CUNY

- I. Introduction: The Historical Background
- II. The Eparchy of Minsk and its Suffragan Sees
- III. Autocephaly: The First Attempt (1922)
- IV. The Renovationalist Schism in Byelorussia (1922-1941)
- V. Autocephaly: The Second Attempt (1927)
- VI. The Orthodox Church in Poland (1921-1980)
- VII. Patriarchal Jurisdiction Reestablished in Byelorussia (1939-1940)
- VIII. Autocephaly: The Third Attempt (1942)
- IX. The Byelorussian Orthodox Autocephalic Church in the Emigration (1948-1980)

Appendix A: Eparchies and Hierarchs

- 1. List of Orthodox Eparchies in Ethnic Byelorussian Territory as of 1917
- 2. The Primates of the Polish Orthodox Church: 1921-1980
- 3. The Hierarchs of the Byelorussian Orthodox Autocephalic Church in the Emigration: 1948-1980

Appendix B: Documents

- 1. A Decree of Patriarch Tikhon (1920)
- 2. A Letter of Patriarch Tikhon (1921)
- 3. Greetings from the [Renovationalist] Holy Synod of Byelorussia to "the Third All-Russian Council" (1925)
- 4. An Encyclical Letter of Bishop Filaret et al. (1927)
- 5. The Statute of the Autocephalous Byelorussian Orthodox Church (1942)
- 6. The Condition of the Smolensk Eparchy [Dec. 1942-Jan. 1944] (1954)

Bibliography

*Copyright © 1983 by Thomas E. Bird

I. Introduction: The Historical Background

The history of the emergence, dissolution, and reconstruction of institutional Orthodox Church life in Byelorussia under Soviet rule provides an illustration of how the pragmatic demands of Russian national policy alter traditional canonical practice.

Orthodox canon law provides for the existence of an autonomous Orthodox Church in each nation-state. Likewise, the Soviet Constitution is replete with language which guarantees cultural and administrative autonomy to each national republic. Indeed, according to Article 72 of the Constitution of 1977, the fundamental law of the USSR, the Byelorussian SSR is conceived of as a state unit of a national group which even has the right to secede from the Soviet Union.

The praxis followed outside the Russian SFSR, however, has been anomalous; three different strategies or approaches can be discerned in the quixotic application of these outside the RSFSR:

1. In the Georgian SSR, the status of the Georgian Orthodox Church was upgraded from that of an **exarchate** (its ecclesiastical rank during the 19th and early 20th century) to full independence (or **autocephaly**, to use the canonical term), in 1943. In practice, the independence which is promised in law has been undermined by the tactics of the Moscow Patriarchate during the past twenty years.
2. In the Ukrainian SSR, the intermediate ecclesiastical rank of **exarchate** has been conceded to the institutional church structure in that republic. This is the canonical status conceded to a geographical area outside the Patriarchate proper, but subordinated to the jurisdiction of that body.
3. In the Byelorussian SSR, Moscow Church authorities have refused to recognize the autonomy and autocephaly proclaimed at various times in this century by the local Orthodox hierarchs in the Republic, viz., in 1922, 1927, and again in 1942. The Patriarchate has reduced institutional structures to ■ single **diocese**, headed, invariably, by an ethnic Russian.

That appointee was called "Exarch" at the beginning of the forties and has held the rank of metropolitan in recent years. This change may indicate an upgrading in rank out of consideration for the stature and rank enjoyed by the Republic or to give the appearance of such consideration.

Thus, church structures in the BSSR contradict the usual rhetorical pronouncements concerning the equality of the fraternal republics of the USSR. Prescinding from the seniority which

the Georgian Orthodox Church enjoys*, comparable, even-handed treatment of the Orthodox communities in the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR might be expected in light of this rhetoric. Such is decidedly not the case. No concessions to the separate nationalities in these latter two nation-republics have been made by the Soviet government or the central Orthodox Church authorities.

The fact that the Orthodox Church in Byelorussia is accorded the lowest possible rank, that of a diocese, can be viewed in this context as a matter of imposed ideology which goes against the demographic and political reality as well as popular sentiment, not to speak of Orthodox tradition. The expression of national aspirations in the area of ecclesiastical life in Byelorussia, in fact, has proven to be calamitous for the proponents of autocephaly, who have been systematically imprisoned, exiled, or executed.

The vicissitudes of politics and history have seen church boundaries shift over and around the territory of present-day Byelorussia for nearly a thousand years.

Historians record the earliest Byelorussian eparchies (the traditional Orthodox term for what Western Christians call dioceses) in the appanage principalities (*udzielnyja kniastvy*): Polatsk, founded in 992; Turaŭ-Pinsk, founded in 1005; Smalensk in 1101. Separate eparchial structures in what was geographically and ethnically Byelorussia developed until, in 1291, the Navahradak Metropolia was formed and proceeded, on its own initiative, to subordinate the other eparchies in the region to itself. Patriarch John XIII Glykys of Constantinople recognized and ratified this Metropolia at the beginning of his reign (1316-1320), an event of some moment in the Orthodox world of that time, and the Navahradak Metropolia sent delegates who participated in the Patriarchal Synods of Constantinople held in 1317, 1327, 1329.

At local councils of the Orthodox Church in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania* in 1415, Byelorussians exercised their autocephaly in the election of Gregory Tsamblak as their metropolitan.

* The Georgian Orthodox Church has been autocephalous since 1057 except for the period 1801-1917. The diptychs of world Orthodoxy assign the Georgian Church the sixth place among the fifteen autocephalous Orthodox Churches. Although the Georgian Orthodox hierarchy proclaimed its autocephaly once again on March 25, 1917, the Patriarchate of Moscow only recognized that rank in 1943 because of the personal intervention of the former Georgian seminarian, Josef Stalin, who then headed the Soviet Government. One can suppose that his intervention in this matter grew out of sentiments of national loyalty.

* The name of the multi-national medieval state that included, among others, Byelorussia and Poland.

The growth of the power and authority of the see of Moscow, which became autocephalous in 1448, was linked to the political fortunes of the state of Muscovy. The result, over the ensuing four centuries, was a diminution of the authority of the Byelorussian Metropolia and its eparchies and, by the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the suppression of any notion of their independence from the center of political and ecclesiastical power in Moscow.

During the Napoleonic campaigns in the early nineteenth century, Archbishop Varlaam Šyŭacki of Mahiloŭ was able to renew, for a brief time, the autocephaly of the Byelorussian Church. For the remainder of the nineteenth century three eparchies, — Minsk, Mahiloŭ, and Vitsebsk — functioned as simple eparchies in the network of the Russian Orthodox Church/Moscow Patriarchate. The next attempt to reestablish church independence did not come until 1922.

II. The Eparchy of Minsk and its Suffragan Sees

A major change in administering and regulating the life of the Orthodox Church in Byelorussia followed Catherine II's inclusion of the Byelorussian lands in her spreading empire. Minsk was established as the seat of the eparchy — replacing the ancient Eparchy of Turaŭ — in 1778 in the city of Slutsk. This eparchy embraced Western Byelorussia, Volhynia, and Podolia. The incumbent bore the title "Bishop of Minsk and Volhynia, Coadjutor to the Metropolitan of Kiev, and Archimandrite of the Monastery of Slutsk." In 1796, following the third and final partition of the Commonwealth of Poland, Volhynia was separated from the Minsk Eparchy and, two years later, Archbishop Iov (Potiomkin) translated the episcopal seat from Slutsk to Minsk. Following these shifts, the Minsk Eparchy was extended into the Hrodna District and into part of the Vilna District, including the city of Vilna, acquired by Catherine II in 1795. By ukaz of the Holy Synod, the Minsk Eparchy consisted of two guberniias, Minsk and Hrodna, plus Courland. The incumbent's title was changed to "Bishop of Minsk and Hrodna," that is, the ruling bishop's archieparchal status was reduced to that of a simple eparch.

As a consequence of the union of the Byelorussian Eastern Rite Catholics with the Russian Orthodox Church in 1838, a division, ostensibly along demographic lines, was made in this area and the Eparchy of Vilna was established, separate from that of Minsk. The ruling hierarch of Minsk was given the title of "Bishop of Minsk and Turaŭ," which title remained until the beginning of the Soviet period.

In 1910 a Vicar Bishop with the title "of Slutsk" was estab-

lished, with his residence in the monastery of the Holy Trinity in Slutsk. Ioann (Pommers) was appointed the first Vicar Bishop. He later became Archbishop of Riga and Latvia.

The Russo-German front (after 1915) and then the Revolution of 1917 played havoc with religious as well as political life in the area of Byelorussia. The growth of national awareness, which had begun in the nineteenth century, blossomed again in the first two decades of the twentieth century, culminating in the Byelorussian Democratic Republic (March 25, 1918), and then in the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (January 1, 1919). The rise of national self-consciousness found concrete expression in the political as well as the ecclesiastical and cultural spheres.

In 1920 the Council of Ministers of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic addressed a letter to Patriarch Tikhon of Moscow "Concerning the Status of the Orthodox Church in Byelorussia, largely under Polish Occupation." [Cf. Document 2 in the Appendix]. The Ministers requested permission for the bishops of the Byelorussian eparchies to use the Byelorussian language in sermons, catechesis, supplementary liturgical services, etc., and the right to publish the Scriptures, homilies, and other materials for church use in the Byelorussian language.

Although he was reluctant to replace ruling bishops — whose efforts in behalf of the cause of Orthodoxy had proven to be efficacious — simply because they did not speak Byelorussian, the Patriarch nonetheless "recogniz[ed] . . . that this desire is justified [and] resolved to keep this wish in mind during all subsequent replacements of episcopal sees in in the Byelorussian eparchies."

In November 1920 the Patriarch issued a decree with an even broader focus. Concerning the possible establishment of an eparchy [Cf. Document 1 in the Appendix], the Patriarch, the Holy Synod, and the Highest Church Council decreed that:

In case an eparchy finds itself outside of communion with the Highest Church Authority, or if the Highest Church Authority itself, headed by the Patriarch, for some reason ceases its activity, the eparchial hierarch shall immediately establish relations with the hierarchs of the neighboring eparchies in order to organize the highest body of church government for the several eparchies which find themselves in similar circumstances (as a temporary superior church governing body or metropolitan district or whatever).

This decree was to have far-reaching impact both in Byelorussia and throughout the entire USSR.

When Patriarch Tikhon was arrested on May 9, 1922, his Vicar, Met. Agafangel of Jaroslav, issued a remarkable letter

which was also to have an influence on the life of Orthodox Christians for decades to come. It read:

Beloved of the Lord, Most Holy Archpastors!

Deprived temporarily of higher direction, you will now administer your eparchies independently, in accordance with the Gospels, the sacred canons, henceforth until the reestablishment of the Higher Church Authority, definitively decide matters on which formerly you requested the permission of the Most Holy Synod, and in doubtful cases apply to Our Humble Person.

Bishop Georgij (Jaroševskij) had been appointed Bishop of Minsk in 1916 and in 1921 was translated to Warsaw as Orthodox Metropolitan of Warsaw and All Poland. He was assassinated on February 8, 1923 by a priest who felt that he had betrayed the Russian Church.

Bishop Georgij was succeeded by Bp. Melkhisedek (Pajeŭski), a major figure in the history of Byelorussian Orthodoxy, whose biography deserves to be more widely known. Because of the pivotal role which he played in the life of the Byelorussian Church in the crucial early years of Soviet rule, a few lines should be devoted to him.

Born in Ščytniki in 1876, he was baptized Mikhal. After his birth, Mikhal's father was ordained to the priesthood and served in the monastery church in Kobryn. Mikhal attended the monastery school, the Vilna Theological Seminary, and the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. Upon completion of the Academy course, Mikhal accepted monasticism, taking the name Melkhisedek, and joined the community of the Monastery of St. Michael in Bjalyński where, in due time, he was appointed **igumen** (abbot). The date of his consecration as bishop and the names of the ordaining hierarchs are unknown to me. His first assignment was as Bishop of Tavrida and subsequently (1914-1918), he held the post of Archbishop of Astrakhan. Following this, he was for a time Vicar Bishop of Ladoga-St. Petersburg. He participated in the Moscow Council of 1917-1918 and in 1919 became Vicar Bishop to Abp. Georgij of Minsk. With that hierarch's translation to the See of Warsaw in 1920, Bp. Melkhisedek succeeded as Bishop of Minsk.

On July 23, 1922, Bp. Melkhisedek invoked the patriarchal decree of November 7/20, 1920 and assumed the title of Metropolitan of Byelorussia. He simultaneously proclaimed the **de facto** autonomy of his administration. John S. Curtiss notes that Melkhisedek's proclamation provoked a bitter struggle with the Renovationist forces. (Cf. Section 4).

III. Autocephaly: The First Attempt (1922)

The First Council of the Orthodox Church of Byelorussia convened on July 23, 1922 in the Cathedral of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul in Minsk, despite opposition from the Renovationist church leaders on the one hand and a hostile civil government on the other. The Council took the following decisions:

1. to restore the rank of metropolitan in the Byelorussian Orthodox Church;
2. to elect Abp. Melkhisedek (Pajeŭski) metropolitan with the title of Minsk and Byelorussia;
3. to reestablish four eparchies: (a) Minsk, (b) Babrujsk, (c) Mazyr, and (d) Slutsk;
4. to elect the following three candidates to the episcopate:
for Babrujsk: **Filaret** (Khvyados Ramienski, former professor of the Minsk Theological Seminary);
for Mazyr: **Ioann** (Ivan Pašyn, former pastor of the parish church in Prylepy);
for Slutsk: **Mikalaj** (Mikalaj Šematsila, former rector of the Slutsk cathedral).

The Treaty of Riga in March, 1921 had established the boundaries between the Soviet Union and Poland, which left Byelorussia split in two. With its signing, the leaders of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic were able to initiate a policy of cultural and educational Byelorussification in earnest. A wide variety of national organizations was established — scholarly, pedagogical, and others — and the Byelorussian press began to flourish. In this heady atmosphere of new-found national self-awareness and relative freedom, it was only to be expected that the Byelorussian Church leadership gave expression to a long-felt desire for an independent and nationally-oriented life for their Church.

A temporary statute governing the Minsk Metropolia was adopted, providing, among other things, for the introduction of the Byelorussian language into Divine Services. The minutes of the council were taken by Fr. Apanas Martos, but unfortunately, all acts and documents concerning this council perished in the anti-religious campaign which followed immediately thereafter. The council closed on October 10, 1922.

The metropolia established by this First Byelorussian Council of 1922 was not destined to enjoy a long life. During 1923, as part of a general campaign against the church leadership, Met. Melkhisedek and a number of his priests were arrested and tried, charged with confiscating and concealing precious religious objects such as chalices, ikon frames, etc. Although the metropolitan was found guilty, the sentence was suspended and he was released and left for a time in relative peace. One church chronic-

ler, Nadezhda Teodorovich, recalls a pastoral letter issued by Met. Melkhisedek, dated October 12, 1923, in which he assured his flock that neither the title of metropolitan nor the autocephaly of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church had been questioned, censured, or annulled by Patriarch Tikhon.

In the second half of 1925 Met. Melkhisedek was summoned to Moscow by Met. Sergij (Starogorodskij) and did not return to Minsk. Met. Melkhisedek's denunciation by the Renovationist Archbishop of Smalensk at the 1925 Renovationist Council marks him as a solid churchman, well aware of the dangers involved in the Renovationist Adventure and unwilling either to participate himself or to allow his clergy or faithful to have anything to do with it. While it is true that Met. Melkhisedek joined the Gregorian schism,* headed by Abp. Gregory (Jatskovskij) of Ekaterinburg, he remained associated with that group for only one year. Arrested and exiled to Marynsk labor camp in Siberia, he was freed through Met. Sergij's intervention and, in 1927, was reduced in rank and appointed Archbishop of Enisej and Krasnojarsk. In 1931 he was once again invited to Moscow "to participate in the summer session of the Holy Synod," and on May 17 of that year, while vesting for the Divine Liturgy, he died. The place of his burial is not known.

The temptation to strive for independence from central authority was apparently a powerful one. In December 1924 a convocation of parish councils of the Dubroŭna congregations (near Orša) in Byelorussia proclaimed their autocephaly, but in even more sweeping terms than had been used at the 1922 council. Their statement declared that "the religious societies of Dubroŭna . . . separated and withdrawing from subordination to the Mahiloŭ Church Directorate and the Byelorussian Orthodox [Renovationist] Synod, pronounces the aforementioned religious societies autonomous, independent of anyone — subject to no church hierarchy."

After Met. Melkhisedek's departure from his see in the latter half of 1925, the Minsk Eparchy was left without an incumbent. It was governed *pro tem* by Bp. Ioann (Pašyn) of Mazyr (who subsequently died in a concentration camp); then by Bp. Mikalaj (Šemitsila) of Slutsk until his arrest, imprisonment, and death in prison in 1931; and finally by Bp. Filaret (Ramienski) of Babrujsk until his imprisonment and death in 1939.

As these Byelorussian Orthodox eparchies were left vacant,

* The Gregorian Schism, which began in December 1925 under the leadership of Abp. Gregorij, occurred when a group of bishops who were loyal to the Patriarchate, refused to recognize the authority of Met. Sergij (Starogorodskij). For a time the Gregorians enjoyed the favor of both Met. Pjotr (Poljanskij), the acting head of the Church after the death of Patriarch Tikhon, and of the Soviet Government.

they were occupied by hierarchs of the Renovationist Schism who proclaimed the establishment of the Autonomous Renovationist Church of Byelorussia.

IV. The Renovationist Schism in Byelorussia (1922-1941)

The Renovationist (or Living Church) Schism began to take shape in the early twenties. A group of accommodationist Communist Party ideologists decided that it might be possible to replace the legitimate Orthodox Church headed by Patriarch Tikhon, which they considered fundamentally counter-revolutionary, with a church organization and leadership that would be more amenable to the ideas of the Soviet Government. The official policy of "no compromise with religion" continued to be espoused by the more doctrinaire. Meanwhile, effective state-and-party support of this new religious group represented a temporary maneuver, an attempt to encourage dissatisfied and unstable "reform-minded" churchmen who were sympathetic with the new regime to assist in weakening and ultimately in annihilating the authentic Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union. By using the same vocabulary as the Russian Orthodox Church, insisting, in the words of one of their leaders, Aleksandr Vvedenskij, that "Renovation is Orthodoxy, and the Renovated are Orthodox," and finally, by maintaining that the Renovation stood in continuity with the Orthodox Church which had existed in the Russian Empire for centuries, the schismatics achieved a certain degree of success.

Canonical "reforms" (which in fact were generally alien to traditional Orthodox practice and custom and constituted a Protestantizing reformation) were a major part of the Renovationist program. These included such practices as adoption of the New (Gregorian) Calendar, permission for widowed priests to marry a second time, and the appointment of bishops from the ranks of the married clergy.

By granting significant advantages to the Renovationist leadership (such as access to the press), and by acts of overt collusion aimed at promoting their cause (such as isolating and arresting Patriarch Tikhon and systematically harassing and persecuting those churchmen who remained loyal to the patriarchate), the political authorities were able to advance the Renovationist Movement for several years.

Claiming continuity with the Russian Council (Sobor) of 1917-18 (which they called "the First All-Russian Council"), the Renovationists convened two "councils," "the Second All-Russian Council," beginning in April, 1923; and "the Third All-Russian Council," beginning in September, 1925.

With assistance from the political authorities, the Renovationists occupied church buildings, including many cathedrals of the Orthodox Church, and proceeded to appoint and elevate one another to high ecclesiastical posts. The observation of an English scholar, Henry St. John, O.P., in another context is apposite here. "A marked characteristic of this dream-world is a *folie de grandeur* of high-sounding titles and more than extravagant pretensions, . . . generally in inverse ratio to the number of their adherents . . ." [Peter F. Anson, *Bishops at Large*, p. 16].

Although the Renovationist Schism never enjoyed major success in attracting believers in Byelorussia, it is undeniable that a great many Renovationist hierarchs were appointed to eparchies in the Republic, beginning with those vacated by the Orthodox bishops some of whom have been mentioned above, viz., Bransk, Homel, Mahiloŭ, Polatsk, Smalensk, and Vitsebsk, but also in the cities of Bialyničy, Čaussey, Orša, Rečytsa, and Veliž-Vysočan. Numerous church buildings in these and other cities were taken over and held by the Renovationists.

The former Russian Orthodox Archbishop of Kostroma, Serafim (Meščerjakov) can rightly be considered the founder of Renovationism in Byelorussia. He was the first of the Renovationists to hold the title of "Metropolitan of Byelorussia" [1922-24]. He later repented of his schism and was received back into communion with the Patriarchate.

His successors were four in number: Abp., later Met. Vladimir (Kirillov) [1924-26]; Abp., later Met. Iosif (Krečetovič) [1926-36], an attractive and effective proponent of the Renovationist Movement; Met. Daniil (Gromovenko) [1928-29]; and Met. Piotr (Blinov) [1936-38]. Piotr (Blinov) and Aleksandr (Ščerbakov) of Vitsebsk were two of the most zealous — and long-lasting — of the Renovationist hierarchs. Piotr, as indicated, ruled until the very late thirties; in 1923 he was one of the four "metropolitans" who were in favor of depriving Patriarch Tikhon of his clerical and patriarchal offices. Aleksandr came out of retirement and attempted to assume the leadership of the Renovationist Movement after the death of First Hierarch Aleksandr (Vvedenskij) in July 1946.

Implementing the decrees of the Renovationist Council of 1923, ecclesiastical administrations were established in Byelorussia, the Far East, Siberia, and Ukraine. The Renovationist Church in Byelorussia had become autonomous by a Proclamation of the First Regional Council of Mahiloŭ, meeting May 17-19, 1924. It was governed by a Council and its own Holy Synod and enjoyed the right to send delegates to the All-Russian Councils and to seat its representatives on the All-Russian Holy Synod. The autonomy which it enjoyed presumed canonical communion with the All-Russian Holy Synod meanwhile reserving to the Byelorussian Renovationists some flexibility to maneuver. They

were, of course, bound to the decrees adopted by the "Second All-Russian Council of 1923." John S. Curtiss estimates that some 500 parishes (out of a total of 1,000 in the whole Byelorussian SSR) belonged to the Renovationist Metropolia by the beginning of 1925. This would appear to have marked the acme of Renovationist popularity in Byelorussia. A very significant decline in Renovationist parishes can be noted between 1925 and 1927.

At the Pre-Sobor Plenum held in Moscow, January 21-27, 1925, the decision was taken to establish the seat of the Western Metropolitan District in Smalensk. A report, submitted by the Byelorussian Holy Synod, was heard; the Plenum confirmed the ecclesiastical autonomy and the establishment of the Byelorussian Holy Synod.

During the second half of May 1925, the Byelorussian Holy Synod convened a Local Council, which, *inter alia*, sent greetings to the Patriarchs of the Eastern Orthodox patriarchates.

The "Third All-Russian Local Council" (Renovationist) took place in Moscow October 1-10, 1925. 334 delegates with the right to vote were in attendance, thirteen of whom were delegates from Byelorussia. Their names and eparchies:

Hierarchs

Met. Vladimir (Kirillov) of Mahiloŭ and Byelorussia
Abp. Aleksij (Diakontsev) of Smalensk
Bp. Aleksandr (Ščerbakov) of Vitsebsk
Bp. Mikhail (Sviderskij) of Veliž-Vysočan
Bp. Pjotr of Bransk
Bp. Pjotr (Vinogradov) of Homel

Clergy

Archpriest Brausevič of Minsk
Archpriest Breč of Veliž-Vysočan
Archpriest Gaskevič of Homel
Archpriest Šimkevič of Mahiloŭ
Priestmonk Evstafij (Safron) of Homel

Laity

Anna Pavlovna Vronskaja of Homel
Mr. Lepin of Veliž-Vysočan
Mr. Čistjakov of Mahiloŭ

At the October 1 session of the Third All-Russian Council Abp. Aleksij (Diakontsev) of Smalensk spoke briefly but sharply, in criticism of Abp. Melkhisedek (Pajeŭski) of Minsk for not having accepted an invitation to attend the Council.

When the Renovationist Higher Theological School was

opened in 1926 — without the authority to grant degrees, unlike the Academies in Moscow and Leningrad — one Renovationist hierarch from Byelorussia, Abp. Lollij (Jur'evskij) of Mahiloŭ, was named to its faculty.

Met. Serafim (Ružentsev) of Moscow presented a statistical report to the regular Plenum of the Renovationist Holy Synod, held January 30-February 5, 1927, in which he indicated that in Russia as a whole the highest percentage of Renovationist parishes was in the Far East, where over 60% of the parishes recognized the schismatic Holy Synod. In Byelorussia, Smalensk was the only eparchy which he singled out for mention. It was listed among the "moderate eparchies;" he claimed that only 40.2% of the parishes in the Smalensk Eparchy were under Renovationist control.

According to 1928 figures published by the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Churches in the USSR, there were in October, 1927 one hundred churches and 153 clerics who recognized the Renovationist Holy Synod. Although six other Renovationist eparchies were listed as existing in Byelorussia, (viz., Minsk, Mahiloŭ, Mstsislaŭ, Orša, Polatsk, and Vitsebsk), no data were given for them regarding the number of churches or clerics functioning there.

The status of the Renovationist Church in Byelorussia was a topic of considerable discussion in meetings and publications of the sect. By the mid-thirties it had been deprived of its autocephalous status. One Soviet historian writes that the autocephaly was liquidated on Dec. 20, 1934 by Synodal action; another asserts the nullification of that rank was accomplished *motu proprio* by First Hierarch Vitalij (Vvedenskij).

The Renovationist hierarchy in the BSSR perdured for approximately two more years. The 1936 list of the Renovationist episcopate in Byelorussia included six vigorous figures:

Met. Iosif (Krečetovič) of Byelorussia
Abp. Aleksij (Kopytov) of Orša
Abp. Gavriil (Sviderskij) of Bialyničy
Bp. Aleksandr (Ščerbakov) of Vitsebsk
Bp. Fjodor (Bekarevič) of Čaussy (Vicar of the Homel Eparchy)

Two years later only two Renovationist bishops remained in Byelorussia, viz., Met. Pjotr (Blinov) of Minsk and Byelorussia, and, Met. Aleksandr (Šubin) of Smalensk. There were apparently only 35 bishops left in the active Renovationist hierarchy throughout the entire Soviet Union as of that date. As organizational discipline broke down, these bishops moved with great frequency from one eparchy to another. By the beginning of 1941, the Renovationist adventure had, for all practical purposes, disappeared from Byelorussia.

V. Autocephaly: The Second Attempt (1927)

On August 9, 1927 a two-day conference of clergy and laity was convened in Minsk on the initiative of Bp. Filaret (Ramienski) of Babrujsk. The delegates proclaimed themselves the Second Council (Sabor) of the Orthodox Church of Byelorussia and, reviving the autocephalous status proclaimed five years earlier, adopted statutes which confirmed the decisions of that First Council and stressed their right to be free from all interference by the Moscow Patriarchal authorities.

An Encyclical Letter was composed and widely distributed at the conclusion of this Council. Addressed to "the Beloved Pastors and Believing Children in Christ of the Orthodox Church of Byelorussia," it affirmed that the work of the conference was principally concerned with the vital interests of the entire Byelorussian Church. The authors noted that in 1922, just as the Renovationist Schism was mounting its opening campaign throughout the country, the notion of autocephalous status for the legitimate Orthodox Church in Byelorussia had been bruited about by church people concerned with putting their ecclesiastical affairs on a firm foundation. They spoke of the joy with which the act of proclaiming the autocephaly of the Byelorussian Metropolia was greeted by the Orthodox population. They noted that the Moscow Patriarchal authorities had refused to lend their support to this move and, indeed, had responded with outright enmity, and, that the five years which had ensued had, as a result of these various external pressures, reduced the Byelorussian Metropolia to a state of paralysis. They concluded that in the intervening years the idea of autocephaly had by now deeply penetrated the thinking of the Byelorussian Orthodox faithful who had come to view it as a "saving anchor" against the strong and dangerous tides which threaten the bark of Byelorussian Orthodoxy. The desideratum of autocephaly was defended in the encyclical as following the path of canonical regularity" and as being "historically necessary," in accordance with ancient canon law, the rulings of the early Church councils, and the practice of the pre-Revolutionary Patriarchal Church of Russia. The Encyclical concluded with the hope that the decisions and actions of the Council would find a lively echo in the souls of both pastors and laypeople and that other Byelorussian eparchies would join with the Minsk See in a proposed All-Byelorussian Provincial Council to accomplish fully the task of launching the Byelorussian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. The letter was signed on behalf of the entire council, by the presiding hierarch, Bp. Filaret, a protopresbyter, five archpriests, and a psalm-reader.

The Soviet historian, Aleksandr A. Šiškin asserts that of 1,000 parishes in Byelorussia in 1926, approximately 500 of them in four eparchies, entered the autocephalous church organization headed by Bp. Filaret.

The next decade saw the Byelorussian Church engaged in a losing battle for survival against the power of the Soviet State. During the night of July 29, 1937 the Soviet authorities mounted their last "pogrom" against the Orthodox Church of Byelorussia. The vast majority of the Church's leaders was utterly destroyed.

VI. The Orthodox Church in Poland (1921-1980)

Any attempt to delineate the history of Orthodoxy in Byelorussia must necessarily devote some attention to the area of Western Byelorussia which, in the years 1921-1939, was included in "the Orthodox Church in Poland."

Before World War I these territories were constituent parts of the Russian Empire. According to the terms of the Treaty of Riga (March, 1921), these lands, which counted among their inhabitants approximately four million Orthodox Christians (for the most part, Byelorussians and Ukrainians), were included in the Republic of Poland. Following the border adjustments of the post-World War II period, these areas were included in the BSSR on the grounds that they were ethnically Byelorussian. Thus, there is good reason to deal with them in this essay on the basis of their Byelorussian character, although in terms of political boundaries, they belonged to the Polish Orthodox Church during the twenties and thirties.

In August, 1918 Patriarch Tikhon of Moscow created the new Eparchy of Palesye and notified Bishop Dionysius (Waledinski) of this fact. In 1921 the Eparchy of Pinsk and Navahradak was reestablished and Bishop Pantelejman (Ražnoŭski) was appointed its ruling bishop. The Archimandrite of the Jabłeczna Monastery, Siarhej (Karaloŭ) was appointed Bishop of Bielsk.

According to the provisions of the Polish Constitution of March 17, 1921, religious liberty was provided for; normalization of the State's relations with the various religious denominations was to be carried out according to the statutes of the respective religious bodies.

In August, 1921 the Polish Minister of Confessions summoned Abp. Georgij (Jaroszewski), who had just returned from Italy, Bp. Dionysius (Waledinski), and Bp. Pantelejman (Ražnoŭski) to Warsaw and advised them of the Polish Government's desire that the Orthodox Church in Poland be granted autocephalous status. Since this entailed the end of ecclesiastical dependence upon the Russian Orthodox Church, a goal much desired by the indigenous Byelorussian and Ukrainian communities in Poland, the hierarchs were able to assure the Minister of their full co-operation in this enterprise.

On September 15/28, 1921 a decree was published over the signature of Patriarch Tikhon naming Abp. Georgij (Jaroszewski)

of Minsk and Turaŭ the ruling bishop in Poland *pro tem*, with the title of "Patriarchal Exarch" and specifying that the archbishop enjoyed the rights of a provincial metropolitan. This was the first document ever issued by the Moscow Patriarchate which suggested the existence of any canonical separation of the Orthodox Church in Poland from the Moscow Patriarchate. Abp. Georgij convened a council of three hierarchs on January 24, 1922, consisting of himself, Bp. Dionysius, and Bp. Pantelejman. The Director of the Ministry of Confessions brought copies of a proposed concordant which were duly signed by the members of the Council of Bishops.

In April, 1922 Patriarch Tikhon was arrested. On February 8, 1923, Abp. Georgij was assassinated by a Russian priest, Archimandrite Smaragd (Latyšnikov) who was opposed to the archbishop's policy of *los von Moskau*. Shortly after the assassination, the Council of Bishops of the Orthodox Church in Poland was convened and Dionysius of Kremenets, recently promoted to the rank of archbishop, was elected to the widowed cathedra of Warsaw.

Early in 1922 a decree was promulgated by the Ministry of Church Affairs and Education entitled "Temporary Regulations concerning the Mutual Relations between the Government and the Orthodox Church in Poland." The question of liturgical languages and the languages to be used for preaching was a topic which arose early and repeatedly in the deliberations of the Holy Synod during the early twenties. The decision was finally taken to approve liturgical texts in Byelorussian, Czech, Polish, and Ukrainian.

After lengthy negotiations, Patriarch Gregory VII of Constantinople and the Holy Synod of that patriarchate granted autocephalous status to the Orthodox Church in Poland in a charter (*tomos*) dated November 13, 1924. As Primate of the new Church, Abp. Dionysius assumed the rank of metropolitan with the title of distinction "Beatitude," appropriate for the head of an independent Orthodox Church.

On February 10, 1925 a concordat was concluded with the Holy See governing the position of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland. ("The Roman Catholic Faith, which is the religion of the overwhelming majority of the nation, takes first rank in the State among religious denominations, which enjoy equal rights.")

In 1938 two documents were published by the Polish Government which defined the status of the Orthodox Church in its relations with the Polish State, "The Internal Statute of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church" and a presidential decree entitled "On the Relation of the State to the Polish Orthodox Church." These gave the State a deliberative role in the selection and appointment of all ecclesiastical posts in the Polish Republic and represented a limitation of the functioning of Orthodox Church life as compared with the previous fourteen years. These two legal instruments mark a significant increase of government

involvement in the internal affairs of the Polish Orthodox Church.

In September 1939 Soviet armed forces moved into Eastern Poland, reuniting Western Byelorussia with the BSSR. That part of Poland which was occupied by Soviet troops — the Warsaw-Kholm Eparchy and part of the Hrodna Eparchy — immediately came under the canonical jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. That part of Poland under German occupation looked to Abp. Serafim (Lade) of Berlin as their canonical authority. The Church which Met. Dionysius headed was henceforth known as the "Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the **Generalgouvernement**" and consisted of three eparchies, viz., Kholm-Podlakhia, Cracow-Lemko, and Warsaw. With the Soviet occupation of Western Byelorussia and Western Ukraine, Poland lost the Volhynia, Vilna, Palesseye, and most of the Hrodna Eparchies, which passed under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate.

By a Patriarchal Ukaz dated October 17, 1939, the church authorities in Moscow appointed Abp. Pantelejman (Ražnoŭski) Bishop of Pinsk-Navahrada, with the title of "Exarch of the Moscow Patriarchate." Abp. Pantelejman notified all the hierarchs of Western Byelorussia and Western Ukraine of his appointment and requested declarations from them recognizing the Moscow Patriarchate as their canonical authority. They all replied and, in the summer of 1940, they were invited to Moscow to formalize their union with the Moscow Patriarchate. Abp. Aleksij (Hromadskyj) of Kremenets and Volhynia and Bp. Antony (Martsenko) of Kamen-Kaširsk (on June 25, 1940); Abp. Pantelejman (Ražnoŭski) (on July 20, 1940); and Bp. Simon (Ivanovskij) of Ostrog (on August 21, 1940). Abps. Aleksandr (Inozemtsev) of Palesseye, Feodosij (Fedos'ev) of Vilna/Lithuania, and Polykarp (Sikorskyj) of Lutsk did not make the trip to Moscow.

By a Patriarchal Ukaz dated July, 1940 Abp. Nikolaj (Jaruševič), Exarch of Ukraine, was named "Exarch of Western Byelorussia," replacing Abp. Pantelejman, who was named ruling archbishop of the newly-created Eparchy of Hrodna-Vilna.

During the summer of 1940 all the hierarchs of Western Byelorussia and Western Ukraine were summoned to Moscow to regularize their reunification with the Moscow Patriarchate. Abp. Pantelejman was received on July 10, 1940. That same month the Exarch of Western Ukraine, Met. Nikolaj (Jaruševič) was named Exarch of Western Byelorussia as well as Metropolitan of Volhynia and Lutsk. He replaced Abp. Pantelejman, who was named ruling bishop of the newly-created Hrodna-Vilna Eparchy.

When Met. Elevthery died in December 1940, Met. Sergij (Voskresenskij) was named to succeed him, with the title of Metropolitan of Vilna and Lithuania and Exarch of the Baltic Region.

In June, 1941 the German-Soviet War shifted boundaries and again altered circumstances. Western Byelorussia and West-

ern Ukraine were occupied by Nazi troops who remained there until 1944.

By a Patriarchal Ukaz dated July 15, 1941 exarchal responsibilities for the eparchies of Western Byelorussia were transferred to the oldest ruling eparchial hierarch present there.

On September 9, 1941 Met. Dionysius established the **Biela-ruskaja Carkoŭnaja Rada** (Byelorussian Church Council) which proceeded to elaborate a memorandum, expressing the desire for a normalized church structure in Byelorussia and proposing as candidates for the episcopal sees three archimandrites living in Poland, viz., Feafan (Prataševič), Filafej (Narko), and Apanas Martos). Feafan's consecration was not acted upon. (He was killed in August 1944 during the first days of the Warsaw Uprising). Filafej was consecrated on November 23, 1941 in the Žyrovitsy Monastery. Apanas was elevated on March 8, 1942 in the city of Minsk.

Met. Dionysius laid claim to jurisdiction over those parts of Byelorussia and Ukraine occupied by German troops. A memorandum in reply dated July 15, 1942 summoned him to the office of Gubernator Fischer who ordered the Metropolitan to remain totally aloof from church affairs in those areas.

Six weeks later, on August 30, 1942, an All-Byelorussian Orthodox Council was convened in Minsk. It reaffirmed the autocephaly of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church and proceeded to deal with a variety of related issues. [Cf. Section VIII.]

When the German armies began to retreat from this area, during July 1944, the Byelorussian bishops were evacuated to Germany and their story continues in the Section concerning the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church (BAOC) in the emigration.

The first eparchies to be reestablished in Byelorussia after the German forces had been driven out were Minsk, with the appointment in September, 1944 of Bp. Vasilij (Ratmirov) as ruling bishop; and Brest, with the appointment that same month of Bp. Paisij (Obraztsov).

**

With the consolidation of the Socialist regime in Poland, and the establishment of political ties with the USSR, a new status for the Orthodox in Poland was considered a necessity. Sentiment grew among the clergy that the autocephaly granted by Constantinople in 1924 had been inappropriate, indeed, some claimed uncanonical. In 1945, Met. Dionysius was placed under house arrest. A delegation of bishops and clergy went to Moscow on June 19, 1948 with the request that their "canonical situation be rectified."

On June 22, 1948 the Holy Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate granted autocephaly to the Polish Orthodox Church. In 1951, at the request of the Polish Orthodox hierarchy, the Moscow Patri-

archate released Abp. Makarij (Oksiuk) of L'viv and Ternopil to become the first Primate of the newly-autocephalous Church. The metropolitan instituted a vigorous policy of russification which served to alienate the majority of the faithful, who remain ethnically Byelorussian and Ukrainian in background.

The present Primate, Met. Basil (Doroszkievich) is a Polish-born cleric of Byelorussian descent. The official organs of the Polish Metropolia are the monthly *Cerkownyj Wiestnik*, published in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian, and the quarterly, *Wia-domości Polskiego Autokefalicznego Kościoła Prawosławnego*, published in Polish. Until the 1970's classes for Orthodox seminarians were conducted in Byelorussian and Ukrainian, but that practice has since been discontinued in favor of Polish and Russian. The Metropolia consists of four eparchies: Warsaw-Bielsk, Białystok-Gdańsk, Łódź-Poznań, and Wrocław-Szczecin. Recent data list over 200 parishes, nearly 200 priests, 300 churches and chapels, over 200 catechetical centers and two religious houses, a men's monastery in Jabłeczna (Bielsk-Podlaski District), and a women's convent in Grabarka (Siemiatycze District). The current statistics indicate a decisive decrease in the number of Orthodox believers from the pre-World War II situation, to a figure of approximately 400,000.

VII. Patriarchal Jurisdiction Reestablished in Byelorussia (1939-1940)

With the occupation of Western Byelorussia and Western Ukraine by Soviet troops in September, 1939, the Eparchies of Volhynia, Vilna, Palesseye, and the greater part of the Hrodna Eparchy were incorporated into the Moscow Patriarchate.

After the absorption of the city of Vilna and the Lithuanian republic into the Soviet Union in 1940, Met. Eleutherius (Bogojavlenskij) was given jurisdiction over the Eparchy of Vilna and Lithuania.

Since that time, the Eparchy of Minsk, although remaining a simple diocese within the Moscow Patriarchate, has served as a stepping stone for several important hierarchs to some of the most responsible positions within the Patriarchate. It has been ruled over by some of the most eminent prelates of the Russian Orthodox Church, including Pitirim (Svidirov), Nikodim (Rotov), Sergij (Petrov), Antony (Mel'nikov), and Filaret (Vakhromeev), of whom some held the rank of metropolitan when they were translated to Minsk and others received that rank while serving as the incumbent of that see.

**
*

In view of the growth and importance of the Byelorussian SSR, it is reasonable to look forward to the time when the church

organization in Byelorussia will, like its sister-republic to the south, enjoy the ecclesiastical status of an exarchate and will function as a metropolia with its suffragan eparchies restored and vicar bishops assigned to them.

VIII. Autocephaly: The Third Attempt (1942)

In keeping with an overall policy of encouraging separatist tendencies within the Soviet Union, the General Commissariat of Byelorussia, (as the governing body of the German occupying authorities was called), wanted the Orthodox Church in Byelorussia to be autocephalous, national, and Byelorussian in orientation. Its head, Met. Pantelejman (Ražnoŭski) [1867-1950], was to be totally independent — subordinate neither to Met. Sergij (Starogorodskij) of Moscow, Met. Dionysius (Waledinski) of Warsaw, nor to Abp. Serafim (Lade) of Berlin. He was to have the title of "Metropolitan of Minsk and All Byelorussia;" and the church was to be called the Byelorussian Autocephalous Orthodox National Church.

Two considerations militated in favor of the selection of Met. Pantelejman as head of the new autocephalous Byelorussian Church. He was a bishop in good standing with the Moscow Patriarchate; and he was renowned as a scrupulous observer of church canons. It was felt that this combination would lend credence in important church circles outside the Republic to his incumbency as head of the new Church and would assist in gaining recognition for the proclamation of autocephaly.

The metropolitan was, for all of this, not the most felicitous choice as primate of the new autocephaly. Half-Polish and half-Russian, he was a firm Russian patriot. He preached in Russian, commemorated Met. Sergij of Moscow in the Divine Liturgy, and ordained a number of Russian candidates to the priesthood, subsequently assigning them to Byelorussian parishes. It was only at the end of the war that he was persuaded to permit the introduction of the Byelorussian language into the rural parishes as a liturgical language. There was considerable discontent with the metropolitan's attitudes and a widespread desire developed for the appointment of an assistant bishop of Byelorussian background and sympathies.

Met. Dionysius of Warsaw, however, considered that Western Byelorussia, which was part of Poland between 1921 and 1939, belonged to his canonical jurisdiction. To give substance to this claim, he established a body, the **Bielaruskaja Carkoŭnaja Rada**, the Byelorussian Church Committee. At its first session on September 9, 1941, the Committee drafted a memorandum which was sent to the authorities in Berlin. It proposed three candidates for consecration as bishops: Archimandrites Apanas (Martos), Feafan (Prataševič), and Filafej (Narko). In a reply dated

September 18, 1941, the German authorities assured the Rada of their support for this proposal.

Archimandrite Filafej was, in fact, consecrated Bishop of Slutsk in the Žyrovitsy monastery on November 23, 1941 by Met. Pantelejman and Bp. Benedict.

In early 1942 a memorandum from a group of Church activists was sent to the General Commissariat of Byelorussia urging:

- 1) that the head of the Orthodox Church in Byelorussia be concerned about national affairs;
- 2) that Met. Pantelejman be retired to the Žyrovitsy monastery and that Bp. Filafej be installed as his successor;
- 3) that two candidates be consecrated bishops:
 - (a) Archimandrite Apanas (Martos) and
 - (b) Archpriest Symon (Sieŭba); and
- 4) that Bp. Benedict (Babkoŭski) be brought back from his sojourn in the Žyrovitsy monastery and reassigned to an eparchy in Byelorussia;
- 5) that a statute be elaborated to bring into being the autocephalous status of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church.

In early February 1942, Bp. Filafej was received by Generalkommissar Wilhelm Kube's political assistant, Dr. Jurda, and the contents of the memorandum were discussed. Shortly after this visit, Met. Pantelejman and Archpriest Jazep Balaj visited the Generalkommissariat.

Met. Pantelejman then corresponded with Bp. Filafej and obligingly provided him with a written order ordering that:

- 1) homilies and catechism classes be given in Byelorussian;
- 2) that the baptism of Jews be forbidden (this, at the insistence of the Nazi authorities);
- 3) that Bp. Filafej take upon himself the task of working out a statute for the governance of the Church; and
- 4) that authority over the Minsk Metropolia and over all the parishes in the East, except for those under Bp. Benedict's jurisdiction, be given over to the jurisdiction of Bp. Filafej.

The Council then proceeded to divide Byelorussia into five eparchies: Minsk, Mahiloŭ, Smalensk, Vitsebsk, and Navahradak. Assignments were made as follows:

Met. Pantelejman (Ražnoŭski)	Archbishop of Minsk and Metropolitan of All Byelorussia
Bp. Filafej (Narko)	Bp. of Mahiloŭ and Mstislaŭ
Archimandrite Apanas (Martos)	Bp. of Vitsebsk and Polatsk
Archpriest Symon (Sieŭba)	Bp. of Smalensk and Bransk
Bp. Venjamin (Babkoŭski)	Bp. of Navahradak and Baranavičy

Archimandrite Apanas (Martos) was consecrated Bishop of Vitsebsk on March 8, 1942 by Met. Pantelejman, Bp. Benedict, and Bp. Filafej. The following week Met. Pantelejman advanced Bp. Filafej to the rank of archbishop.

Archpriest Symon Sieŭba accepted monasticism, taking the name Stsiapan. He was promoted to the rank of archimandrite and consecrated Bishop of Smalensk and Bransk on May 16, 1942 by Met. Pantelejman and Bp. Filafej.

Weary of the onslaught of unaccustomed and demanding pressures, on June 1, 1942 Met. Pantelejman gave Abp. Filafej a decree that turned over the government of the Byelorussian Metropolia to him. The following day he retired to the monastery of Žyrovitsy.

The ecclesiastical leadership took the indigenization of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church as their primary order of business.

Abp. Filafej's first memorandum ordered that russophile clergy be replaced. He immediately began to consider Byelorussian clerics for membership in the Minsk Eparchial Consistory.

In his second memorandum the archbishop called for the following steps to be undertaken:

- 1) the formation of a Metropolitan council;
- 2) the dispatch of Bp. Stsiapan to Smalensk and of Bp. Venjamin to Mahiloŭ;
- 3) the consecration of a hierarch for the Polatsk Eparchy;
- 4) the formation of a consistory consisting of three Byelorussian priests;
- 5) the registration of all the deaneries in the Byelorussian Church to be carried out by July 10, 1942;
- 6) the organization of a council with lay and clerical makeup, whose members should be nationally self-conscious Byelorussians;
- 7) the organization in every eparchy of pastoral courses to prepare Byelorussian candidates for the priesthood;
- 8) the dispatch of clergy from the western regions of the country to the east where they should set up deaneries;
- 9) the nomination of a commission to review and possibly rework the church statute approved by the General Commissar of Byelorussia;
- 10) the nomination of a commission to review the financial affairs of the Metropolia; and
- 11) the appointment of an editorial board which would publish a monthly periodical devoted to church affairs.

Abp. Filafej announced that a Council would open on August 28, 1942. He instructed the clergy to have each parish elect one cleric and one layperson as delegates. He advised the clergy and faithful that the Council had as its goals: (1) the proclamation of

the autocephaly of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church; and (2) the adoption of a statute for the Church.

The All-Byelorussian Orthodox Council (**Sabor**) opened in Minsk on August 30, 1942. The participants included:

- 1) Abp. Filafej of Mahiloŭ and Mstsislaŭ, Protector of the Metropolia of All Byelorussia;
- 2) Bp. Apanas of Vitsebsk and Polatsk;
- 3) Bp. Stsiapan of Smalensk and Bransk;
- 4) 17 delegates from the clergy of the Navahradak-Baranavičy Eparchy;
- 5) 22 delegates from the laity of the Navahradak-Baranavičy Eparchy;
- 6) 26 delegates from the clergy of the Minsk Eparchy;
- 7) 42 delegates from the laity of the Minsk Eparchy;
- 8) 1 representative from the laity of the Smalensk region;
- 9) Members of the Pre-Conciliar Commission who took part with a consultative vote.

The Church was forced to follow the political-administrative divisions imposed by the German authorities. As a result, several Byelorussian eparchies were not permitted to maintain contact with the Byelorussian Metropolia, viz.,

- 1) the Hrodna Eparchy was included in East Prussia;
- 2) the Vilna and Smarhon Eparchies belonged to the Lithuanian Commissariat;
- 3) the Brest and Pinsk Eparchies were attached to the Ukrainian Commissariat.

These assignments and attachments were cited as grounds for denying them permission to attend and participate in the Byelorussian Church Council.

Because of this interference by the German authorities, the Council created an autonomous eparchy and placed Bp. Benedict in charge of it with the title of Bielaŭstok and Hrodna. The vacant Brest Eparchy was turned over to the Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church. The clergy there elected Ioann (Laŭrynenka), the bishop of Kovel, as their bishop. Following his election, he adopted the title of Bishop of Brest and Kobryn.

The participants understandably spent considerable time discussing the question of autocephaly. On the first day of the Council Archpriest Jazep (Balaj) read a paper on "The Canonical Bases of Autocephaly." This was followed by Archpriest Ioann (Kushnier)'s paper on "The Question of Autocephaly in Byelorussia." Abp. Filafej spoke after this, asserting that the autocephaly of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church already existed, and that what remained to be done was its canonical formulation, adoption by the Council, and notification of other autocephalous Orthodox Churches.

The archbishop put the question of establishing the Byelorussian Orthodox Church as autocephalous to the Council. The motion passed overwhelmingly; there were three abstentions. The Council then proceeded to develop a draft of a statute for the autocephalous Byelorussian Orthodox Church. The delegates examined the draft, adopted it, and the bishops in attendance signed it. A text was agreed upon for an official epistle notifying the Patriarchate of Constantinople of the actions of the Council and requesting the Patriarch's good offices in notifying the sister Orthodox Churches and obtaining recognition from them. After dealing with the question of religious education and some matters pertaining to church property, the Council concluded its deliberations on September 2, 1942.

The hierarchy of the Byelorussian Church continued to grow — both by the consecration of new candidates and by adhesions from other jurisdictions.

At the beginning of the 1943 Bp. Stsiapan requested that Met. Pantelejman consecrate Archimandrite Pavel (Meletiev), a Russian, as his Vicar Bishop for the city of Bransk. After seeking the advice of Abp. Benedict and Bp. Apanas, Met. Pantelejman and Abp. Filafej performed the consecration in Minsk on July 11, 1943. Bp. Pavel was named Bishop of Roslaŭ, Vicar of the Smalensk Eparchy.

As a candidate for the Homel Eparchy (now included in the Commissariat of Ukraine), Abp. Benedict proposed Archpriest Georgij Baryškievič, a cleric of Ukrainian descent. On September 18, 1943, Archpriest Georgij was tonsured with the monastic name of Ryhor; the following day he was advanced to the rank of archimandrite. His consecration took place in Vienna at the hands of several hierarchs of different jurisdictions, viz., Met. Anastassij (Gribanovskij), Met. Serafim (Lade), Met. Serafim (Luk'janov), Bp. Filip (Gardner), and Abp. Benedict (Babkoŭski).

Abp. Ioann (Laŭrynenka), the Bishop of Brest, petitioned the Byelorussian Synod of Bishops to be received from the Ukrainian Autonomous Orthodox Church into their midst. He was received with the title Archbishop of Palesseye and Brest and henceforth styled himself Abp. Jan.

There is a disagreement about the affiliation Met. Aleksandr (Inozemtsev) of Palesseye. Some historians claim that, having heretofore belonged to the jurisdiction of Met. Dionysius of Warsaw, he petitioned to be received and was accepted in May 1944 as Archbishop of Pinsk. Abp. Apanas disputes this, saying that Met. Aleksandr was invited to join the Byelorussian Church, but that he procrastinated, and, in the end, never became a member of that Church.

These petitions, adhesions, and new consecrations reflected the growing sense of confidence among the hierarchs in the new autocephalous Orthodox Church in Byelorussia. The fact that Met.

Pantelejman, although living in semi-retirement, continued to lend his support to the Church, coupled with the stature and experience of such men as Stsiapan and Benedict, and the logical "ingathering" of the ethnic Byelorussian eparchies around the administrative center in Minsk meant that a stable, credible church body was emerging.*

Thus, in the middle of 1944 the Byelorussian Orthodox Church consisted of the following eparchies

1) Minsk-Vilna	Met. Pantelejman (Ražnoŭski)	1867-1950
2) Navahradak-Baranavičy	Bp. Venjamin (Novitski)	
3) Brest-Palessye	Abp. Jan (Laŭrynenka)	
4) Smalensk-Bransk	Bp. Stsiapan (Sieŭba)	1872-1965
	Bp. Paval (Meletiev)	1880-1962
5) Bielastok-Hrodna	Bp. Benedict (Babkoŭski)	1876-1951
6) Mahiloŭ-Mstsislaŭ	Bp. Filafej (Narko)	1905-
7) Vitsebsk-Polatsk	Bp. Apanas (Martos)	1904-
8) Homel-Mazyr	Bp. Ryhor (Baryškievič)	1889-1957
And perhaps:		
9) Pinsk	Abp. Aleksandr (Inozemtsev)	-1948

IX. The Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church (BAOC) in the Emigration (1948-1980)

At the end of June, 1944, in the face of the oncoming Soviet troops, the hierarchs of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church, together with many clergy and church activists, went west, to Germany.

Shortly after the beginning of the year 1946, a Council of the Byelorussian Orthodox hierarchs was held with six bishops in attendance. The agenda consisted of the question of joining the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia.

Such a radical change of direction in the thinking of these bishops deserves examination. It should be remembered that these hierarchs had been educated and raised according to the canons of the Orthodox Church. The notion of ecclesiastical life outside the Patriarchate of Moscow was, in fact, not a familiar one. Their ideological outlook and cultural background militated against the adoption of an independent line, even though Orthodox canon law provides for the autocephalous status of each indigenous Orthodox Church with three requisite hierarchs. They had not enjoyed the peaceful and serene ambience which would

* The ethos and agenda of the Council convened on May 12, 1944 by Met. Pantelejman deserves separate, extended treatment. It will be dealt with in a subsequent study.

have permitted them to digest and internalize the concept of membership in a hierarchy separate from the Russian Church. The conditions of war led them to become associated with a powerfully and vigorous movement that produced a separate republic and an autonomous church structure. But their participation ran contrary to their most deeply ingrained instincts. They were, in fact, autocephalists *malgré soi*.

At this 1946 Council three bishops, Abp. Filafej (Narko), Bp. Apanas (Martos), and Bp. Jan (Laŭrynenka) favored maintaining the status quo, i.e., of preserving their independence; while Met. Pantelejman (Ražnoŭski), Bp. Benedict (Babkoŭski), and Bp. Stsiapan (Sieŭba) were in favor of full unity with the Russian Bishops in Exile, without any reservations. Since their senior hierarch, Met. Pantelejman, was positively disposed to the idea of merger, the three contrary-minded bishops decided, after discussion and consultation, to retain their unity as a body of Byelorussian bishops and enter the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia.

This move by the episcopal leadership of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church was perceived by many of the clergy and laity as treason to the idea of autocephaly. It served as the catalyst leading to the convocation of the Council of Konstanz in 1950. There candidates were nominated for the vacated episcopal roles in the abandoned jurisdiction and clergy and laity delegates reconstituted the Byelorussian Orthodox Church in the Emigration.

In an effort to make their affiliation more palatable, the Russian bishops proposed a kind of compromise whereby the Byelorussian bishops would retain their right to resolve independently matters pertaining to the Byelorussian Orthodox Church.

On February 10/23, 1946, a Council of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia convened and examined a request of the Bishops of the Orthodox Church of Byelorussia that they, their clergy, and faithful be received into full fraternal and prayerful communion and administrative unity. After consideration, the Russian bishops voted to accept these Byelorussian hierarchs and include them in their episcopal synod.

As events evolved, the Byelorussian bishops were assigned — contrary, as they felt, to both the spirit and assurances given them during the pre-merger discussions — as Vicar Bishops in essentially Russian eparchies: Abp. Filafej in Wiesbaden, Bp. Apanas in Hamburg, Bp. Ryhor in Bamberg, and Bp. Stsiapan in Salzburg.

Abp. Jan (Laŭrynenka) returned to the Moscow Patriarchate; from 1946 to 1952 he served as Bishop of Molotov and Solikamsk.

Bp. Paval (Meletiev) was received into the Roman Catholic Church and lived out his days in a Benedictine monastery in Belgium.

With the death of Met. Pantelejman in 1950, the direction

of Byelorussian church affairs in Central and Western Europe passed to Abp. Benedict, then serving as Archbishop of Berlin and Germany within the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia, (ROC/OR).

The story of these hierarchs who submitted to the ROC/Outside Russia lies beyond the scope of the present study. The continuing role which some of these hierarchs played within the Byelorussian community deserves separate analysis.

A significant number of the faithful who had been supporters of the Autocephaly and had participated in its Councils also fled from the Soviet armed forces and immediately following the conclusion of World War II, these Byelorussians began to organize parishes of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church in all the Byelorussian camps for displaced persons.

Supporters of the Byelorussian autocephaly were anxious to preserve the BAOC in the emigration and a committee consisting of U. Tamaščyk, V. Kiendyš, and M. Haroška approached the bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) in 1947 and sought their assistance.

A Council of the BAOC (reckoned the First Council of the BAOC) was convened in Konstanz, West Germany on June 5, 1948, where the matter was clarified and resolved. Bp. Serhij (Okhotenko) was received from the UAOC into the BAOC as First Hierarch. The Council of Bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church consecrated Archimandrite Vasil (Tamaščyk) with the title of Vilna of the BAOC on December 19, 1949; participants were Abp. Serhij (Okhotenko), Bp. Platon (Artemjuk), and Bp. Vjačeslav (Lisitskyj). Bp. Serhij presided over three sessions of the BAOC Clergy-Laity Congress, in 1960, 1963, and 1966.

On February 15, 1968 Mitred Archpriest Andrej Kryt was consecrated Bishop of Hrodna-Navahrada and Cleveland by Abp. Serhij (Okhotenko) and Bp. Dmitrij (Balač) in Adelaide, Australia.

On March 10, 1968 Archimandrite Mikalaj Macukievič was consecrated Bishop of Turaŭ-Pinsk and Toronto by Abp. Serhij (Okhotenko), Abp. Vasil (Tamaščyk), Bp. Donat (Burtan), and Bp. Dmitrij (Balač) in Adelaide, Australia.

Twenty-five years after the reorganization and reconstitution of the BAOC and the convening of its First Council, the Second Council was held in Highland Park, New Jersey on May 27-29, 1972. This conclave restored the metropolitanate to the BAOC and elevated Abp. Andrej (Kryt) to the rank of metropolitan, giving him responsibility for America and Australia, with residence in Cleveland, Ohio.

In May, 1974 Bp. Mikalaj (Macukievič) was elevated to the rank of archbishop and given responsibility for Belgium, Canada, and England, with residence in Toronto.

Appendix A: Eparchies and Hierarchs

Item 1: List of Orthodox Eparchies in Ethnic Byelorussian Territory as of 1917*

HRODNA: founded in 1900

Vicariate: **Bielastok**, founded in 1907

LITHUANIA: Under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Kiev until 1595; From 1596 until 1839 in union with Rome; united with the Russian Church in 1839.

Vicariate: **Brest** (1839-1900)

MINSK: founded in 1793

Vicariate: **Slutsk** (1912)

MAHILOU: founded in 1632 as an Orthodox eparchy in Poland under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Kiev (until 1793)

Vicariate: **Homel** (1907)

POLATSK: founded in 1104. From 1596 to 1620 and from 1661 to 1833 in union with Rome. United with the Russian Church in 1833.

Vicariate: **Džvinsk** (1913)

SMALENSK: founded in 1137. From 1415 to 1419 and from 1458 to 1518 under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Kiev and Lithuania.

*Igor Smolitsch, *Geschichte der Russischen Kirche 1700-1917* (Band 1), Leiden, 1964, pp. 705-709.

**Item 2: The Primates of the Polish Orthodox Church:
1921-1980**

Moscow Appointment

1921-1923 Abp. Georgij (Jaroszewski)
Ruling Bishop in Poland, Patriarchal Exarch

Constantinople Autocephaly

1924-1948 Met. Dionysius (Waledinski)

Moscow Autocephaly

1951-1961 Met. Makarij (Oksiuk)
1961-1962 Met. Timoteusz (Szretter)
1962-1965 **Sede vacante**
1965-1969 Met. Stefan (Rudyk)
1969- Met. Basil (Doroszkewicz)

**Item 3: The Hierarchs of the BAOC in the Emigration:
1948-1980**

Primates

Abp. Serhij (Okhotenko)	1890-1971
Abp. Vasil (Tamaščyk)	1900-1971
Met. Andrej (Kryt)	1901-1983

Suffragans

Abp. Mikalay (Macukievič)	b. 1917
---------------------------	---------

Appendix B: Documents

Document 1

A Decree of Patriarch Tikhon (1920)*

In the midst of the purges of the clergy, Patriarch Tikhon of Moscow, elected by the All-Russian Council of November 5, 1917, held in Moscow, foreseeing the sad fate of the Orthodox Church in Russia, together with the Holy Synod and the Highest Church Council, issued a decree, No. 362, on November 7/20, 1920, in which it was said:

"In case an eparchy finds itself outside of communion with the Highest Church Authority, or if the Highest Church Authority itself, headed by the Patriarch, for some reason ceases its activity, the eparchial hierarch shall immediately establish relations with the hierarchs of the neighboring eparchies in order to organize the highest body of church government for the several eparchies which find themselves in similar circumstances (as a temporary superior church governing body or metropolitan district or whatever). In case it is impossible for the hierarch to have the cooperation of the agencies of eparchial government, the most appropriate measure would be to divide the eparchies in the following manner: (a) the governing hierarch will give all the rights of eparchial hierarchs to his Most Reverend Vicar Bishops; (b) he will establish — on the basis of the judgement of the Council, consisting of the other eparchial hierarchs — new eparchial seats with the right of semi-independent or [full] independence."

This patriarchal decree gave extensive rights and authorization to the eparchial hierarchs regarding the organization of church life during these difficult years in the life of the Orthodox Church in Soviet Russia.

* Archbishop Afanasij [Martos], *Belarus' v istoričeskoj gosudarstvennoj i tserkovnoj žizni*, Buenos Aires, 1966, p. 258.

A Letter of Patriarch Tikhon (1921)*

No. 104

**To: The Chairman of the Council of Ministers
of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic**

In reference to Your letter of January 14 [1920], I have the honor to inform you of the following:

The Memorandum of the Government of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic "Concerning the Status of the Orthodox Church in Byelorussia and, largely under Polish Occupation," which was sent to me on January 27 of last year has been duly received.

Because of the special importance of the problems raised by this Memorandum, I have submitted it to discussion by the Holy Synod and the Highest Church Council, which, under my chairmanship constitutes and represents the entire episcopate, the clergy, and the faithful of the Orthodox Church.

After very detailed discussion, the Highest Church Administration resolved:

- (1) To allow the Bishops of the Byelorussian eparchies (Lithuania, Hrodna, Minsk, Mahiloŭ, Polatsk, and others) the use of the Byelorussian language in those churches where a demand is received from a majority of the parishioners about using the Byelorussian language in so-called supplementary services, in sermons, catechesis, etc., and
- (2) To propose to the Bishops of those same eparchies to begin, if at all possible, to publish in the Byelorussian language sermons, Scriptures, and the New Testament.

As far as concerns the desire of the Government of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic to replace the episcopal sees in Byelorussia with persons who speak Byelorussian, it does not appear possible to achieve this right now because this would mean replacing — without reasonable cause — some bishops who, although they do not speak Byelorussian, are working with success for the good of the Orthodox cause in Byelorussia. Recognizing at the same time, however, that this desire is justified, the Highest Church Council has resolved to keep this wish in mind during all subsequent replacements in episcopal sees in the Byelorussian eparchies.

Notices have been sent to the ruling bishops concerning the aforementioned two resolutions of the Highest Church Administration.

A reply to the Byelorussian Democratic Government was also prepared but, because of the lack of opportunity, it could not be delivered then, and, later, it was included in a number of documents which were sealed up by the Civil Government in the residence of the Chancellery of the Highest Church Administration.

I invoke God's blessing on the entire Byelorussian Nation and prayerfully hope that the Lord will increase its strength in defense of the interests of its own native Orthodox Church.

I invoke God's blessing on your work and on the work of the entire Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

/signed/

Tikhon

Patriarch of Moscow and All Rus'

* **Belaruski S'tsjah** [The Byelorussian Flag], Minsk, No. 1, April-May, 1922.

Document 3

Greetings to the Council (1925)*

2. From the Byelorussian Holy Synod

The Byelorussian Holy Synod unanimously greets the Third All-Russian Council (**Sobor**), which has the achievement of church peace as its cardinal task. The peace of the Mother Church is, for the Byelorussian who, during the years of calamity, found spiritual peace and tranquility only in the Orthodox Church, especially dear and longed-for. However, in his historical church life, the Byelorussian has also encountered proposals of peace and church unity which achieved that peace at the price of betraying Holy Orthodoxy. The Byelorussian never took this path. Protecting the faith of his forefathers as the apple of his eye, the Byelorussian endured much sorrow, shed many tears, and sometimes his blood as well, in the struggle with the cunning Unia; however, he never gave up his Orthodox stand.

The Second Regional Byelorussian Church Council, which just concluded and considered as its main task the achievement of ecclesiastical peace in the Byelorussian Church, established with profound regret the deviation of the so-called Old Church people (**starotserkovniki**) from the pacification of the Church through the deliberations of the Council.

In order to halt the division in the Church the Council recognized the extreme necessity of a wide popularization among the church masses of the sublime ordinances of Christ and invited each faithful son of the Church to take action immediately in order to implement the desired goal—the achievement of ecclesiastical peace, approaching that goal along two paths: external and internal.

The external path does not need special efforts; it will lead unerringly to the goal;—recognize with filial submission **the voice of the Church** as expressed in the decrees of the Councils in disputed questions which are not adequately realized internally, and you will find the desired peace.

The internal path is more difficult;—understand and comprehend each definition, taken separately, of the Council (of 1923). The apparent lack of acceptance of these definitions by individual groups of believers occurs only because of their being totally ill-informed on the one hand, and on the other, by the ill-intentioned distortion of their real meaning by those who are not reconciled with them either from a slavish predilection for the former structure of church life or because of considerations which are far from ecclesial and, indeed, are not religious.

The Second All-Byelorussian Council decreed: henceforth to steer the ship of Byelorussian Church life under the banner of

the Council of 1923. [The Council] summoned all believers and all bodies of church administration, beginning with the parish councils to halt the anarchy in the Church and the divisions in church life generated thereby, which are being kept alive, consciously or unconsciously, and to cease all misunderstandings which have taken place in them as well as between them; and to close ranks tightly and unanimously through their own eparchial organizations which are part of the Holy Synod of the Byelorussian Church and through [the Synod] to be the living conduits of the conciliar fundamentals of church life among the less-aware believing masses.

In the hope that the Third All-Russian Local Council will expose and emphasize with even greater force and depth the bases on which the Second Byelorussian Church Council stood in regard to achieving ecclesiastical peace, the Byelorussian Holy Synod prays to the God of Love and Peace to send down upon the Third All-Russian Local Council the Gift of the Holy Spirit for the present organization and pacification of our Holy Mother, the All-Russian Church.

* *Vestnik Svjaščennogo Sinoda Pravoslavnoj Rossijskoj Tserkvi*, Moscow, No. 6 (2), 1926, pp. 7-8.

Document 4

An Encyclical Letter of Bishop Filaret et al. (1927)*

To the Beloved Pastors and Believing Children in Christ of the Orthodox Church of Byelorussia:

It must be assumed that you are already aware of a conference held in Minsk on August 9 and 10 [1927] consisting of representatives of the Minsk Eparchy, of Old Church people, clergy and laity, at which important decisions were taken, concerning not only the local Minsk church, but the neighboring Byelorussian eparchies immediately bordering it. Since the activity of the conference has a direct relationship to the vital interests of the entire Byelorussian Church in its totality, (although it can be given a malicious interpretation in the eyes of the believing masses), the Eparchial Meeting, which is properly called "Byelorussian," based on the scope of its work, having completed its labors, considers it to be its sacred duty to make known to all Orthodox pastors and laity of the Old Church orientation the results of its activity, for which purpose it addresses them with the following message.

Exactly five years ago, during one of the most critical periods of ecclesiastical disorder, when a breakdown of authority in the Church took place and the Renovationist time of troubles was born, the idea arose among church people in Minsk of protecting their own local Church from serious shock, the notion of the independence of the Byelorussian Church and its right to national self-determination was suggested as its saving anchor. A healthy church instinct for self-preservation and a progressive trend of religious thinking coincided in this ideological movement; nevertheless the act of proclaiming the Byelorussian Metropolia on July 23, 1922, joyously greeted by the entire Orthodox population of the Minsk region, had its true significance undercut by the domination of the Minsk region and, therefore, it did not produce all the potential beneficial results for the Church. Later periods of church life in the Minsk Eparchy, although they gave back to the Old Church people their authentic place, were not favorable to the legitimate desire of Orthodox Byelorussia to organize its own church life based on total independence (autocephaly). The attitude of the ruling church circles in Moscow regarding this question has been changing and unstable, either by being favorable (as it was during the lifetime of the late Patriarch [Tikhon]) or taking the form of patent enmity (as it was under the Locum Tenentes). A tragic five-year period passed and during these years the question of the Byelorussian Metropolia not only did not move to its desired goal but became complicated by various attendant circumstances of church life, until, finally, the

events of recent years brought the Byelorussian Church to a state of paralysis. And it was then that once again there surfaced the idea of autocephaly, an idea which up until then had been suppressed by church currents and currents which had nothing in common with the real interests of the Church. The Byelorussian conference which just concluded demonstrated before our very eyes how deeply this idea has penetrated into the consciousness of the Eparchy and with what unanimity it was sanctioned by conciliar reasoning — by the conference. It could not have been otherwise. When the bonds which had earlier connected the church province with the Higher Administrative Center have outlived themselves, when these bonds do not bring benefit but harm, this province must look for points of support within itself, in the free concentration of its own life forces, in the organization of its own life forces, in the organization of its own administrative structure.

These pressing tasks bring the Byelorussian conference in Minsk to the attention of the other Byelorussian eparchies, underlining the unique importance of the present moment and the extreme necessity for them of an appropriate way out of the situation which has been created. It ought to be clear to them that this path to which they are being summoned is the path of canonical regularity, a path which is historically necessary. For who does not know that the principle of ecclesiastical self-government and federation formed the soul of ancient church legislation and practice (the 34th and 37th Apostolic Rule, the 9th Council of Antioch)? Who does not know that the regional metropolitan governing board was always considered the best, the ideal form of good church structure and order, that this form was dreamed of by the Ancient Russian Councils of the seventeenth century, (1667 and 1681), that even the ancient pre-Revolutionary Synodal Church attempted to revive this form on its own? Who does not remember that the entire history of the Orthodox people, regardless of their state and cultural significance, has been a process of the complex and painful, but always inevitable and productive idea of ecclesiastical independence and self-government? Who, finally, is unaware of certain expressive facts of our local West Russian history, which witness to the presence of this idea in the consciousness of our Byelorussian ancestors (the story of Metropolitan Gregory Tsamblak in the fifteenth century) regardless of the centuries-long religious subjugation under which they lived.

No, in the light of these truths and of indisputable historical facts, no one's unbiased hand dares cast a stone of condemnation at what was accomplished at the conference of August 9-10 [1927], nor risks imposing the brand of Renovation or church schism upon it. In reply to the slander and tale-carrying which is possible in our day, the Byelorussian conference bravely raises its voice and declares: We are convinced and firm in our Orthodox

convictions and doctrines of the Old Church people. We remember the eternal salvation of our souls and wish the best for our native Church. But at the same time we believe that there is no nation which can be considered empty and indifferent material for church life, and which can in justice be denied its free development as a living and active member of the universal Body of Christ.

Let this faith not deceive the participants of the conference and let our hope be strengthened, hope that our voice will find a lively echo in the souls of the pastors and laypeople of the Byelorussian Church and that other Byelorussian eparchies will follow the example of the Minsk Eparchy by organizing proper church representation and government in their eparchies in order that, at the future All-Byelorussian Provincial Council, love of the Church will shine forth and, linked by this love, the Orthodox Byelorussian Church will, with one tongue and one heart, laud the praiseworthy God, One in Trinity. Amen.

[August 1927]
Minsk

Bishop Filaret of Babrujsk
Vicar of the Minsk Eparchy
Protopresbyter V. Očapkovskij
Archpriest S. Kulčitskij
Archpriest D. Pavskoj
Archpriest M. Novitskij
Archpriest A. Kirkevič
Archpriest A. Pigulevskij
Psalm-Reader Ya. Baranovskij

* Ivan Kasjak, *Z historyi pravaslaunaj tsarkvy belaruskaha narodu*, New York, 1956, pp. 170-172.

Document 5

STATUTE OF THE HOLY ORTHODOX BYELORUSSIAN AUTOCEPHALOUS CHURCH*

Adopted by the All-Byelorussian Church Council
(August 8 — September 2, 1942)

I. General Background

1. The Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church preserves unity in matters of dogma and the canons with the Holy Ecumenical Eastern Orthodox Churches. It is independent of all foreign spiritual or civil authority and equal in rights with all the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches
2. The Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Church is governed on the basis of:
 - A. The Word of God written in the Holy Scriptures and
 - B. Sacred Tradition; specifically:
 - (1) the Canons of the Holy Apostles;
 - (2) the Canons of the Seven Ecumenical and Nine Local Councils, recognized by the Holy Ecumenical Orthodox Church.
 - (3) The Canonical Rules of the Holy Fathers, accepted IV, 1; VI, 2, 1, VII, II;
 - (4) Church Canons which pertain to the Divine Liturgy and monastic life.
 - C. Decrees of the Councils of the Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Autocephalous Church, in accord with the Word of God and Sacred Tradition.
 - D. This Statute.
3. The Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church enjoys full freedom of self-government in its internal life.
4. The Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church has the right, without any interference, to govern publicly its Divine Liturgy for the faithful and to conduct religious processions to the Jordan [River] on 6/19 January, on days of what are called church fasts, during funerals, etc.
5. In the Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Autocephalous Church, as a part of the one Ecumenical Orthodox Church, Holy Days are: all Sundays (including the Sacred Entrance of

the Lord into Jerusalem, the first days of Holy Pascha and Trinity, and also the days of the Twelve Great Feasts, viz., the Nativity of Christ, 25-26 December (7-8 January according to the New Style), the Baptism of the Lord 6/19-1, the Synaxis of the Lord 2/15, II, the Annunciation of the Most Holy Theotokos 25/III-7/IV according to the New Style, the Ascension of the Lord, the second day of Pascha, the second day of Trinity (movable feasts), the Transfiguration of the Lord 6/9-VIII, the Dormition of God's Mother 15/28-VIII, the Nativity of the Theotokos 8/21/IX, the Elevation of the Lifegiving Cross 14/27-IX, the Entrance into the Temple of the Most Holy Virgin 21/XI-4/XII according to the New Style, St. Basil the Great 1/14-1, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul 29/VI-12/VII according to the New Style, the Beheading of John the Forerunner 29/VIII-11/IX according to the New Style, the Protection of the Most Holy Theotokos 1/14-X, St. Michael 6/19-XI, and in addition to these, the Altar Feasts

All Twelve Great Feasts, movable and immovable, are celebrated according to the Old Style — the Julian Calendar, accepted in the Eastern Orthodox Church.

6. According to the Word of God (Acts of the Apostles 2, 47; V, 14) and Church Tradition, the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church, on the basis of the Church Canons, has the right and is obliged to receive into her bosom all who turn to her and seek salvation through her. N.B.! Those persons who are forbidden by state law are not received.
7. The acceptance into the Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Autocephalous Church of a different ecclesiastical or religious organization, which has its own internal regulations, is carried out by the Metropolitan in accordance with the Council of Bishops in observance of the Church Canons (I, 19; II, 7; VI, 95; Sardica, 7, 8, St. Basil II, 47).
8. The liturgical language in the Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Autocephalous Church is Church Slavic, as the language of ancient and centuries-old hallowed tradition.
9. The language of church homilies, the teaching of religion, and church government is the Byelorussian language. In all these situations names are used in their Byelorussian form with the exception of using Church Slavic texts.
10. The First Hierarch of the Orthodox Byelorussian Autocephalous Church, according to the 34th Apostolic Rule,

i.e., its First Bishop, Administrator, and Representative in all internal and external relations is the METROPOLITAN.

11. The Metropolitan is the chief representative of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church before the state authorities and is advocate for her in matters pertaining to that church.

The Metropolitan:

- a) Is concerned for the good of his Metropolia (Antioch 9).
- b) Convenes the All-Byelorussian Council, the Holy Council of Bishops, and the Sacred Synod, and presides over them, as well as seeing to it that their decisions are implemented.
- c) Looks out for the filling of Episcopal Sees at the designated time (IV. 25).
- d) Confirms the election of Bishops (I, 4) and consecrates them together with the Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church (IV, 28).
- e) Gives releases to eparchial Bishops (Carthage 32), according to the canonical regulations.
- f) Provides the Bishops with fraternal counsel relative to their personal lives, and also provides instructions regarding their pastoral obligations (St. Cyril of Alexandria 1; Canons of the Holy Apostles 34, 74; Carthage 28, 97; I; Antioch 9).
- g) Considers matters which are the results of personal misunderstandings between the bishops, in the case of their voluntary submission to his mediation, and in this case the decision of the Metropolitan obliges both sides (Carthage 17, 107, 136).
- h) Accepts the complaints of Bishops and launches them in the appropriate direction (Carinth. 28).
- i) Visits all eparchies of his Metropolia (Carthage 63).
- j) Addresses the entire Autocephalous Byelorussian Church with didactic messages and pastoral appeals.
- k) Gives appropriate awards to the Bishops.
- l) Presents individual citations in the form of pastoral blessings to clergy and laity for their useful work for the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church and, on the basis of presentations by the eparchial bishops (Canons of the Holy Apostles 34), makes appropriate church awards to clergy.
- m) Establishes contact with the Heads of other Autocephalous Orthodox Churches in matters concerning dogmas and canons as well as in matters relating to general religious life.

- n) Cares for the timely preparation of Holy Myron for the Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church.
12. The name of the Metropolitan should be elevated in prayers during the Divine Liturgy in all churches of the Metropolia (The First-Second Council of Constantinople of 861, 14) and the Metropolitan elevates the names of the Heads of all Autocephalous Orthodox Churches (The First-Second Council, 15).
 13. The Metropolitan is also the administrative Bishop of the Miensk Eparchy and bears the title "Archbishop of Miensk and Metropolitan of All Byelorussia."
 14. The Metropolitan carries the following signs of his dignity: a white monastic klobuk with jeweled cross, miter with cross and, after recognition by all Autocephalous Orthodox Church of the Autocephalous Orthodox Byelorussian Church, wears two panagias, and during the Divine Liturgy is preceded by a cross.
 15. The Metropolitan, according to the Apostolic Canons (34) and of the Council of Antioch (9), carries out his function with the understanding of the Bishops of his metropolia and uses their advice in deciding all important matters. Eparchial Bishops turn to the Metropolitan for advice and approval in all important matters in their own eparchies (Antioch 9).
 16. The Metropolitan governs the Church as long as he lives, if he does not wish, of his own volition, to renounce the government of his own Metropolia. In the case of his death or activities which bring damage to the Byelorussian Autocephalous Church or violate Holy Orthodoxy, he is deposed by the Council of Bishops of the Holy Autocephalous Orthodox Byelorussian Church, after his trial; and a new Metropolitan is elected by a special electoral Council; consisting of the Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church (Sardica 10, The First-Second Council, 4).
 17. The election should be conducted in accordance with rule 25 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council. The Metropolitan conducts his service according to the [following] canons: St. Peter of Alexandria 10; II, I; Cyril of Alexandria; 3 according to Balsamon.
 18. The Council for the purpose of electing the Metropolitan is convened in Miensk by the senior bishop (according to date of consecration) of the Metropolia. When the Metropolitan cathedra becomes vacant, he becomes "Locum

Tenens of the Metropolitan Throne." The date of convoking the electoral Council is determined in such a way that the Council will take place during a period not later than three months from the time when the Metropolitan cathedra becomes vacant. This Council is presided over by the Locum Tenens.

N.B. The Locum Tenens of the Metropolitan Throne should be of Byelorussian nationality.

19. During the period of carrying out his responsibilities, the Locum Tenens of the Metropolitan Throne performs all the functions of the Metropolitan Throne concerning which he subsequently reports to the newly-elected Metropolitan.

20. The Electoral Council shall consist of:

- a) All Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church, even those who are in retirement.
- b) Those elected by eparchial meetings: two representatives of the laity from each eparchy.
- c) The Synodal Missionary.
- d) Rectors of monasteries, or their deputies if the rectors are bishops.
- e) One representative of the higher and intermediate theological schools, elected by the professors among themselves.
- f) A Professor of theology or canon law from the university in the capital city.

21. 1) Meetings of the Electoral Council are preceded by a pre-election meeting of persons who are members of the Council.

2) The pre-election meeting, chaired by the Locum Tenens of the Metropolitan Throne, nominates from among the Bishops of the Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church three candidates for the vacant throne of the Metropolitan.

22. After the opening of the Electoral Council, the election of the Metropolitan shall take place according to preceding Paragraph 21, from among three candidates, elected by an absolute majority of those empowered to vote, in a secret ballot; votes for other candidates, ballots containing — in addition to the names of the candidates — any notes, and any blank ballots shall be invalid.

23. 1) If, on the first ballot, consisting of three candidates, no one receives an absolute majority of valid votes,

- the election shall be repeated; the Bishop who receives the smallest number of votes shall not be included on the next ballot.
- 2) In the event that all the Bishops or two Bishops receive an equal number of votes, the balloting shall be repeated and, if this ballot has the same result, lots shall be cast to decide which of the Bishops shall be removed from the ballot.
 - 3) If two Bishops receive an equal number of votes on a ballot, balloting shall be repeated; if this time the candidates again receive the same number of votes, lots shall be cast, preceded by solemn prayers.
 - 4) Upon the completion of the balloting and the confirmation of the correctness of the election, based on the minutes of the Electoral Council, the newly-elected Metropolitan shall be conducted by the Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church to the Metropolitan's Throne.
24. The Electoral Council deals exclusively with the election of the Metropolitan. Discussions about the personalities of the candidates for the Metropolitan cathedra are not permitted.
 25. The order of the elections for the Electoral Council and its statute will be separately announced.
 26. In the event that it is impossible to convoke an Electoral Council in the period defined by Paragraph 18 of this Statute, due to reasons beyond the control of the Locum Tenens of the Throne, the Metropolitan will be elected by a Council of Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church, which is convened by the Locum Tenens of the Metropolitan Throne.
 27. The Metropolitan will announce his own election and enthronement of the Heads of all the Heads of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches through a special announcement.
 28. In case of necessity, the Metropolitan's Deputy shall be one of the eparchial Bishops elected by the Council of Bishops.
 29. The Metropolitan's Deputy fulfills his obligations with the mandate of the Metropolitan in those cases where it is not possible for the Metropolitan to fulfill his duties because of sickness or absence.

30. 1) The Metropolitan's Deputy fulfills his obligations within the limits defined for him by the Metropolitan, to whom he reports upon the fulfillment of his functions.
- 2) In special unexpected situations, not foreseen by the Metropolitan, the Metropolitan's Deputy convenes the Council of Bishops, which will resolve the matter.
31. 1) The Metropolitan has a Metropolia Chancellery which serves simultaneously as the Chancellery of the Holy Council of Bishops and of the Holy Synod.
- 2) The Metropolia Chancellery consists of a director and the number of officials needed, as determined by the Metropolitan.

II. The Council of Bishops

32. The Council of Bishops, as inheritor of Apostolic Authority, is the highest organ of church government in the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church and takes final decisions on matters which go beyond the authority of the eparchial Bishops (Canons of the Holy Apostles 24, 1, 4, 5, 6, 1, 2, IV, 19, 8, VI, 6).
33. 1) The Council of Bishops consists of all eparchial bishops and vicar bishops of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church (1, 5, VI, 8).
- 2) The Council of Bishops is convened by the Metropolitan not less than once a year (VI, 8, VIII, 6).
- 3) The Council is presided over by the Metropolitan (Antioch 16). The decisions of the Council of Bishops are passed upon by an absolute majority of votes; in case of a tie, the Metropolitan's vote is decisive.
34. In addition to matters of a dogmatic-religious nature, all matters of administration, education, and finances and the higher judicial-administrative jurisdiction also belong to the sphere of the Council's activity, namely:
 - 1) In the field of church-religious matters:
 - a) Discussion of dogmas of the faith (Canons of the Holy Apostles 37, VII, 6);
 - b) The authoritative interpretation of Church Rules (VII, 1, 2, 6);
 - c) The regulation of all matters concerning the faith, the sacraments, and rituals (VI, 32; Canons of the Holy Apostles 3, 4);
 - d) Certification of the authenticity of Holy Relics, decisions about wonderworking ikons and their reverencing, affirmation and determination of what is taught about the Saints, Relics, ikons of the Saints, and wonderworking springs;

- e) The establishment of rules concerning internal and external missionary activity (Canons of the Holy Apostles 38, VI, 19, 102; Carthage 77);
- f) Concern about the morals of the clergy and the faithful;
- g) Decisions about the election, consecration, transferral, and removal of Bishops (1, 4, IV; Canons of the Holy Apostles 14, 1, 15, III, 9);
- h) Concern about the necessary education and formation of the clergy, catechism teachers, and other clerical persons (II, The Poems of St. Timothy of Alexandria I, II, 2; Canons of the Holy Apostles 30, VI, 33, VII, 2);
- i) The acceptance and sanctioning of new prayers (VI, 18);
- j) The publication of necessary religious books and catechetical textbooks and care about their level of treatment;
- k) The publication of books of Holy Scripture and liturgical books.

2) In the field of church administration:

- a) Making final decisions on all matters in the areas of instruction and faith;
- b) Concern about religious education, financial matters, and church leadership;
- c) The resolution of disputes, misunderstandings, and doubts in church life (Canons of the Holy Apostles 37; VII, 6; Antioch 20);
- d) The determination of rules and obligations for the diocesan and regular clergy, determining their ecclesiastical positions, and their mutual relationship;
- e) Supervision of church property and of the property of other eparchies (VII, 12);
- f) Supervision of church architecture, ikonography, and ecclesiastical chant.

3) In the field of ecclesiastical adjudication:

- a) Court proceedings of the second and final stage;
- b) Acceptance and examination of complaints brought against the Bishops (1, 5), resolution of disputes among them (IV, 17, XI, 25) and court proceedings in the first and final stages over the Bishops (Canons of the Holy Apostles 74);
- c) Authority for determining the relationships between the Church and the state.

III. The Holy Synod

35. The Executive organ of the Holy Council of Bishops is the Holy Synod headed by the Metropolitan (Canons of the Holy Apostles 34, 1, 4).
36. 1) The Holy Synod consists of the Metropolitan and three eparchial Bishops or their vicars, elected by the Holy Council of Bishops for one year.
2) The Holy Synod is convened by the Metropolitan as needed, not less, however, than twice a year (Canons of the Holy Apostles 37).
37. 1) The Holy Synod executes the decisions of the Council of Bishops and the All-Byelorussian Council, and also prepares materials for the proceedings of these Councils.
2) The Holy Synod:
- a) Confirms and removes the heads of men's and women's monasteries;
 - b) Assigns and removes the deans and professors (teachers) of the theological schools;
 - c) Approves the members of the Consistory and Eparchial Missionaries;
 - d) Deposes individuals from the ranks of the clergy and reinstates them;
 - e) Excommunicates persons from the Church;
 - f) Renders final decisions as the last stage in matters of canon-law marriages and divorces;
 - g) The Holy Synod, as the executive which functions permanently at the highest level, administers all ecclesiastical, administrative, judicial, educational, and financial matters of the Metropolia;
 - h) Makes the following awards on the basis of proposals submitted by the eparchial Bishops: the rank of protopresbyter, the rank of archimandrite, the award of the miter, cross jewels, epigonation, citations of blessing, ikons, and the Bible.
38. Within the structure of the Holy Synod there exists an Educational Committee consisting of three members, appointed by the Synod, under the chairmanship of one of the Bishops; it deals with all matters pertaining to the religious schools, the teaching of catechism, and the publishing of school-textbooks of religious content.
39. In addition to this, under the authority of the Holy Synod belong all matters transferred to that body by the Council

of Bishops, with the exception of those mentioned in Paragraph 34, as well as the resolution of the most important ecclesiastical matters requiring an urgent decision, with the obligatory presentation of these matters for the approval of the Council of Bishops.

40. Within the structure of the Holy Synod there also exists a Financial Department which administers all the property of the Metropolia; this Department:

- a) is in charge of movable, most valuable property, and real estate;
- b) has controlling functions over the finances of the eparchy and its correct use;
- c) watches over and conducts the legal defense of church real estate from seizure and misuse;
- d) provides for supplying all items needed for the Divine Liturgy.

41. The Holy Synod appoints a special Control Commission consisting of three persons who maintain control over the financial administration of the Metropolia's institutions, and, to the extent necessary, over eparchial institutions.

IV. The All-Byelorussian Church Council

42. The organ of the Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Church which decides matters in this church in accordance with Holy Tradition is the All-Byelorussian Church Council (II. 2), consisting of Bishops (I, 5; I, 19, IV, 8) and representatives of the clergy and the faithful, which is convened by the Metropolitan periodically (Antioch 19, 20), not less than every five years with [the following] purposes:

- 1) The preservation of the faith and of church order;
- 2) The strengthening and development of church life;
- 3) The fulfillment of the spiritual and moral needs of the children of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church;
- 4) Concern about material needs.

43. The All-Byelorussian Council consists of:

- a) All Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church;
- b) Representatives elected at eparchial meetings from each eparchy: 6 from the clergy and 6 from the laity;

- c) The rectors of monasteries;
- d) The Head of the Žyrovitsy monastery;
- e) The deans of monasteries;
- f) Eparchial missionaries;
- g) The deans of cathedral churches;
- h) Two representatives elected by the professors of the theological schools from among themselves;
- i) In the proceedings of the Council the Director of the Metropolia Chancellery participates in an advisory capacity and, as needed, other functionaries of the same Chancellery, as appointed by the Metropolitan.

44. It is necessary for validity that the decisions of the All-Byelorussian Council be adopted by the majority of those present and be approved by the Council of Bishops who are the representatives of the Holy Apostles and expresses of Church Tradition (VII, 2, 6; KLIM, Rom. Irin. Dion.). Without the sanction and approval by the Council of Bishops, decrees cannot be put into effect.

45. Rules concerning elections and regulations of the All-Byelorussian Council are appended to the present Statute.

V. Eparchies and Bishops

46. The Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Church makes up one Metropolia and is divided territorially into eparchies (II, 2; III, 8; IV, 17; Carthage 84, 67).

47. The boundaries of the Eparchies are determined and altered by the Council of Bishops (IV, 17; VI, 25).

48. The Miensk Eparchy is headed by the Metropolitan with his residence in Miensk. The other eparchies are headed by eparchial Bishops who reside in their respective episcopal residences. Change of the permanent residence of eparchial Bishops, as well as of vicars requires a decision by the Council of Bishops.

- 49) 1) Eparchial Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church are elected by the Council of Bishops, headed by the Metropolitan (I, 4; IV, 28).
- 2) The eparchial Bishop, as the canonical inheritor of the Holy Apostles, is the head and representative of his Eparchy and administers [it] on the basis of the following canons (Canons of the Holy Apostles 81, 83; III, 9; Antioch 9; Carthage 6, 25).
- 3) To the eparchial Bishop belong: the rights of canonical judgement over religious persons, the right to give

them appropriate awards and meritorious citations up to the rank of protopresbyter inclusive, and the right of imposing upon clerical persons administrative and spiritual penances (Canons of the Holy Apostles 15, 27, 55, I, 5, 12, 15, 16; IV, 18; VI, 34, 102; VII, 4; Antioch 17; Sardica 14; Carthage 38, 52; The First-Second Council, 9; Canons of St. Basil the Great 74, 88; Canons of Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria 4, 6).

50. 1) Bishops are under the jurisdiction of the court of the Council of Bishops;
2) Translation and removal of bishops requires a decision by the Council of Bishops.
51. Bishops have the right and obligation to visit all parishes and churches of their eparchies (Carthage 63).
52. 1) Eparchial Bishops may, in case of need, appoint vicar Bishops (Carthage 27).
2) The detailed scope of the responsibilities of vicar Bishops is outlined in the instructions elaborated by the Council of Bishops.
53. Vicar Bishops are elected and consecrated, after presentation by the Metropolitan, by the Council of Bishops.
54. In the event of a vacancy in the cathedra of an eparchial Bishop, or in the event of its being impossible for the eparchial Bishops to fulfill their obligations because of absence or sickness, the eparchy is administered by the vicar Bishop (Carthage 27), and in case the latter is absent — by the Bishop from another Eparchy, temporarily assigned by the Metropolitan.
55. Bishops must belong to the monastic state, possess appropriate spiritual qualifications (VII, 2; Laodicea 12, Sardica 10; The First-Second Council, 17), and higher, or at least intermediate theological education, and be of Byelorussian nationality.

N.B. In the event that there is no worthy candidate of Byelorussian nationality in the rank of bishop, the Council of Bishops may consecrate to the rank of Bishop a candidate of another nationality.

VI. The Spiritual Consistory

56. The administration of the Eparchy is carried out by eparchial Bishops by means of the Spiritual Consistory; and,

in those Eparchies in which there are vicar Bishops, with his help as well.

57. Eparchial meetings, which consist of representatives of the clergy and the faithful, chosen for five years, take place once each year. The Eparchial Bishop convenes this meeting and presides at it.

58. Detailed rules dealing with the scope of its activities, rules concerning elections, and the By-Laws of Eparchial administration are included in the present Statute.

59. The Spiritual Consistory is composed of voting members and represents a permanent executive-administrative body, together with which the eparchial Bishop administers the Eparchy.

N.B. Until such time as the Statute of the Spiritual Consistories is worked out, the Spiritual Consistory shall be governed by the old Statutes for the Spiritual Consistories.

60. To the Spiritual Consistory belong the rights of initiating general questions relating to church-eparchial life, their interpretation, and, after consideration at eparchial meetings and acceptance by the eparchial Bishops, their implementation as well.

61. The Spiritual Consistory is made up of four full-time members, chosen by the Eparchial Meetings for three years, of whom one is in presbyteral rank, who — after election by the Spiritual Consistory and following confirmation by the eparchial Bishops — is Chairman of the Spiritual Consistory.

N.B. 1) The eparchial Bishop, if he considers it necessary, shall personally replace the Chairman of the Spiritual Consistory.

2) In the event of the absence or illness of the Chairman, a member of the Spiritual Consistory in presbyteral rank shall replace him.

62. 1) Making up the Spiritual Consistory are elected persons of Byelorussian nationality, known for their fidelity to the Holy Orthodox Church in the rank of presbyter — four persons not younger than 30, with at least a secondary education.

2) Members of the Spiritual Consistory, after being presented by the eparchial Bishop, are confirmed by the Holy Synod.

63. The Bishop shall remove a member of the Consistory before his term expires if he discovers his inability to fulfill his tasks as a member of the Consistory or for malfeasance of duty and shall temporarily assign a different member at his pleasure, concerning which, he shall notify the Holy Synod.

N.B. 1) If the solution of this matter does not meet with the general approval of the Spiritual Consistory, the matter is decided by a majority of the ballots. In case of a tie, the decisive vote is cast by the Chairman.

2) In the event that an eparchial Bishop does not conform with the decisions of the Spiritual Consistory, the matter is once again considered by the Spiritual Consistory and then, if agreement is not reached, the matter goes for consideration and decision to the eparchial Bishop.

3) Urgent decisions are left to the authority of the eparchial Bishop.

64. At sessions of the Spiritual Consistory the presence of the Secretary of the Spiritual Consistory is obligatory. Without participating in decisions, the Secretary provides clarifications about an issue or information of a legal nature.

N.B. The Secretary of the Spiritual Consistory is appointed and removed personally by the eparchial Hierarchy from among persons who are known for their fidelity to the Orthodox Church.

65. The Spiritual Consistory has a chancellery which is administered directly by the Secretary of the Spiritual Consistory.

66. The Eparchial Control Commission is elected by the Eparchial Meeting for a term of three years. The commission consists of two clerics and two laymen. The Control Commission fulfills its work according to the By-Laws of this Statute, which are appended.

VII. The Religious Court

67. The Religious Court is conducted according to the basic rules of the Holy Ecumenical Eastern Orthodox Church (Carthage 16, Canons of the Holy Apostles 74, Canons of St. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria 1) and the rules issued by the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church.

68. For clergy and laity in matters contrary to the faith or the fear of the Lord, and also in matters of marriage and divorce, the first instance of the Religious Court is the appropriate Spiritual Consistory (IV, 9), the second and final instance is the Holy Synod (Carthage 2, 14, 37, 139; Sardica 14).
69. The Religious Court of the first instance consists of three clerics who are members of the Spiritual Consistory.
70. After the completion of the trial of a cleric or non-clerical person, the Religious Court shall impose appropriate religious punishment—the levels of which are spelled out in the Canons of the Holy Apostles and other appropriate rules, as well as in the Statute of the Orthodox Spiritual Consistories.
71. All matters of church-canonical marriages are subject to review and decision by the Religious Courts, according to the Holy Canons (VI, 54, 72, 93; Carthage 115; Canons of St. Basil the Great 9, 78) and the Statute of the Orthodox Spiritual Consistories. All decisions of Eparchial Religious Courts are confirmed by the eparchial Bishops.

VIII. Deaneries and Parishes

72. The Eparchies are subdivided into deaneries and the latter into parishes. The division of the eparchy into parishes and deaneries is made by the eparchial Bishop (IV, 17; VI, 38).
73.
 - 1) At the head of the deaneries are the deans (Laodicea 57) who fulfill their duties on the basis of instructions issued by the Holy Council of Bishops. Through them the Bishop issues his own instructions and oversees the way of life and behavior of the clergy and the laity from a religious and disciplinary point of view. Deans must be of Byelorussian nationality.
 - 2) Deans and their deputies are selected from among the most qualified rectors of parishes at the deanery meeting and approved of by the eparchial Hierarch.
 - 3) A dean or his substitute is removed by the eparchial Hierarch after it has been established that inappropriate activity has taken place.
 - 4) The dean has a deanery council consisting of five persons: three clerics, one psalm-reader, and one layman, who are elected at the deanery meeting for a term of three years. The members of the deanery council participate in meetings with the right to vote.
 - 5) The deanery meeting consists of presbyteral church-

servants of the deanery, one from each parish.

N.B. Instructions for deans and deanery councils are appended to this Statute.

74. Parishes are headed by rectors (IV, 6; IV, 17; VI, 25, 58; Canons of the Holy Apostles 15).
75. Rectors of parishes are appointed, transferred, and removed by the appropriate eparchial Bishop (Canons of the Holy Apostles 15, 1, 16).
76. 1) In large parishes the assistant to the rector can be the vicar priest and deacons.
2) They are appointed, transferred, and removed by the eparchial Bishop (Rules of the Holy Apostles 15, 29; I, 15).
77. For the needs of the churches, such as reading, singing, and the performance of rites, there are in urban cathedral churches subdeacons and in each parish a psalm-singer. The psalm-singer can have deaconal rank.
78. The rector administers the parish with the fraternal help of other members of the clergy of the parish and, in financial matters of the church and the parish — together with the parish council, which consists of all members of the clergy of the parish, the church chairman, and two elected representatives of the parish. The church council is presided over and led by the rector of the parish.

IX. The Clergy

79. The Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Autocephalous Church prepares candidates for clerical rank in theological schools. II Poems of St. Timothy of Alexandria, II, 2; VI, 19, 33; VII, 2).
80. Candidates for presbyteral and deaconal ordination are ordained by bishops after thorough examination of their fidelity, stability in the faith, charity, humility, (Canons of Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria 7; Sardica 10) and, after being convinced of their moral worthiness (VI, 33; Carthage 3, 4); those candidates must be of Byelorussian nationality and have at least a secondary theological education (VII, 2) and are assigned to urban, rural, and monastery churches (I, 4, 6, 10; IV, 15).

N.B. 1) In the event of a lack of candidates for the clerical rank of Byelorussian nationality, and taking into

consideration that there are parishes with non-Byelorussian population (Ukrainians) — the ordination of candidates of non-Byelorussian nationality to the priesthood is permitted.

- 2) Until the intermediate religious schools or academies are organized — and until such time as those schools produce the necessary number of candidates for the clerical rank, the eparchial Bishops can ordain to the priesthood candidates without intermediate education, after carefully examining them in all subjects of theological learning.

81. The eparchial Hierarch shall transfer priests to other parishes by trial, at their own request, and for the benefit of the Liturgy.
82. The Orthodox Byelorussian Church has men's and women's monasteries based on church rules (IV, 4, 24; VI, 49; VII, 12, 13, 20).
83. A monastery can possess, with the permission of the state authorities, various monastic enterprises, for example: carpentry shops, metal-working and mechanical shops, carving shops for the production of church furnishings and other liturgical items — in metal, wood, stone, etc., and also private ikon-painting schools, tailor shops, and candle-factories, hospitals, ambulatories, orphanages, old-age homes, experimental farmsteads, bee-stations, etc.

X. Teaching the Catechism

84. 1) The Church authorities should see to it that Orthodox children and adults learn the catechism.
- 2) The rector should see to it that Orthodox children and adults receive catechetical instructions in each parish and, in case he cannot do so, this teaching should be conducted by other clerical or lay persons who have the canonical mission from the eparchial Bishop, under the supervision of the rector.

XI. Brotherhoods

85. The parishes may form Brotherhoods so that [the people] become more widely involved in implementing religiously-enlightening activities, maintaining the churches at the proper level, cooperating in organizing solemn Liturgies, and in Christian charitable activities (IV, 3; VI, 74, 68; Laodicea 28; Carthage 51).

86. The brotherhoods may have movable property and real-estate, according to the general and the state laws. The By-Laws of the Brotherhood are authorized by the eparchial Bishop.

XII. Missionaries

87. For spreading the Orthodox faith and defending Orthodox Christians from heterodox teaching there are in the Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Autocephalous Church missionaries and missionary committees which conduct their activities according to the rules issued by the Holy Council of Bishops (Canons of the Holy Apostles 58, VI; Carthage 77).

XIII. Church Property

88. 1) The Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Autocephalous Church, as a single entity (the Metropolia), as well as bishoprics, monasteries, parish churches, and organizations, have the right according to existing rules to acquire real estate and movable property. The property of the bishopric consists of the property of the eparchy and the property of the hierarch's home.
- 2) Church property is under the supervision of the Council of Bishops — and — under the direct control of the Most Holy Synod.
- 3) The property of the Metropolia is under the direction of the Metropolitan and under the supervision of the Council of Bishops.
- 4) The property of the bishopric is administered by the eparchial Bishop with the help of the Spiritual Consistory and the *ekonom* of the hierarchical house (Canons of the Holy Apostles 28, 41, 40; IV; 26, Antioch 25, VII, 12; The First-Second Council 1; Canons of Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria 10).
- 5) Church property is diligently and conscientiously preserved (Antioch 24; Canons of St. Cyril 2) according to the roster of all church property (The First-Second Council, 1; Carthage 42) and is used according to the canons (Theophilus II).
89. 1) Church real estate is in principle not transferable; in exceptional cases this property can be alienated, altered or taxed, or be subject to change of its original intent, based on the decision of the Holy Synod after having been submitted for consideration by the appropriate eparchial Bishop.

- 2) The real estate of the Metropolia can be rented **in toto** or in part on the basis of the decision of the Council of Bishops. The real estate of the bishopric can be rented with the permission of the Holy Synod; real estate of monasteries can be rented with the knowledge of the eparchial Bishop and the permission of the Holy Synod. The real estate of parish churches and church brotherhoods can be rented for one year with the knowledge and permission of the eparchial authority.
- 3) Movable property can be alienated, altered, or subjected to change according to agreement of the eparchial Bishop (Canons of the Holy Apostles 38, 39, 40; IV, 26; VII, 12; Antioch 25).
- 4) In the event that the church authorities liquidate a parish, the property of the church parish is transferred to the property of the bishopric and will be assigned to the general needs of the eparchy, or to one of the neighboring parish churches.

XIV. Theological Schools

90. The Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church has the right to open its own theological schools for the preparation of presbyteral and church servants, namely, one theological academy, theological seminaries, and schools for lectors.
91. 1) The Orthodox Theological Academy is the highest theological school which has the goal of preparing an educated clergy and church activists for the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church.
 2) The Theological Academy is located in the capital city of Miensk under the direct supervision of the Metropolitan of All Byelorussia.
 3) Direct administration of the Theological Academy is carried out by its rector in the rank of Bishop, together with a Council of Professors of the Academy.
92. The Theological Academy has its own internal statute by means of which it regulates all administrative, pedagogical, instructional, and financial affairs. The statute requires the approval of the Council of Bishops.
93. A dormitory for students is located in the Theological Academy.
94. 1) The Theological Seminary is a secondary theological school having as its goal the preparation of qualified

- priests, predominantly for rural parishes, and the preparation of candidates for the Theological Academy.
- 2) At the head of the theological seminaries there must be persons of clerical rank with higher theological education and pedagogical preparation.
 - 3) The direct administration of the theological seminaries belongs to the rector of the seminary, jointly with the Pedagogical Council of the seminary.
95. The theological seminaries should have their own internal statute, approved by the Council of Bishops, which regulates the life of the seminaries.
 96. The patron of the theological seminary is the local eparchial Bishop, who supervises all aspects of seminary life.
 97. There is a dormitory in the theological seminary for the upbringing of the seminarians.
 98. The faculty of the Theological Academy and of the theological seminaries must be persons with higher theological education, with the exception of the teacher of ecclesiastical chant who can have special education, and it is desirable that he be in clerical rank.
 99. The rector and faculty of the Theological Academy and of the theological seminaries are appointed and removed by the Holy Synod.
 100. The curricula for all religious schools — higher, secondary, and lower — are prepared by the Educational Committee of the Holy Synod and approved by the Council of Bishops.
 101. The schools for psalm-readers have the goal of preparing qualified deacons, psalm-readers, and choir directors, as well as auxiliary teachers of catechism, and missionaries.
 102. 1) The direct administrator and supervisor of the school for psalm-readers is a cleric with pedagogical experience.
2) The appointment and removal of administrators and teachers in the schools for psalm-readers belong to the competence of the eparchial Bishop in his capacity as Chief Administrator of the school.

XV. The Pension Fund

103. The Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church can have its own Pension Fund, members of which are

all bishops, clergy, psalm-readers, and monks. Membership in this fund is optional for monks.

104. The Pension Fund has as its purpose the material care of religious persons and their families in the event of the death of a member of the Fund, or his inability to work because of old age, sickness, or retirement.
105. The administration of the Pension Fund and its proper functioning are regulated by a special statute of the Pension Fund, which is approved by the Council of Bishops.

XVI. Eparchial Care

106. In each eparchy care is available on an on-going or one-time basis for poorer clerics and church workers, their widows, orphans, and for poor students of the religious schools.
107. The means for building up the capital of the eparchial care consists in part of voluntary monthly offerings, contributed regularly by clerics who hold eparchial and parish positions; and in part of monthly dues paid by the parish churches. Payments from the churches are mainly for the assistance of poor students in the theological schools.

XVII. Final Decisions

108. In the Metropolitan's see there is published an official organ for the entire Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Church; and each ruling Bishop publishes [a similar organ] for his eparchy. These periodicals are published in the Byelorussian language.
109. This statute can be changed by means of resolutions of the All-Byelorussian Church Council by a simple majority.
110. Detailed By-Laws and regulations mentioned in this Statute shall be finalized by the Holy Synod and confirmed by the Council of Bishops.
111. This Statute becomes effective at the moment it is signed by the Holy Council of Bishops of the Holy Orthodox Byelorussian Church in compliance with Paragraph 44 of this Statute.
112. Authorities and institutions of the Holy Orthodox Autocephalous Byelorussian Church shall use their own seals and stamps with church emblems which shall be inscribed in Byelorussian.

XVIII. Rules of Transition

113. To Paragraph 1: The canonical declaration of autocephaly shall take effect after its recognition by all of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches.
114. To Paragraph 9: The decision of Paragraph 9 dealing with Byelorussian names shall take effect after approval and publication of Byelorussian names by the Holy Synod.

The City of Miensk, 19 May 1944

PANTSELEJMAN, by the Grace of God Metropolitan
Humble VENEDZIKT, Abp. of Bielaŭstok and Hrodna
Humble FILAFEJ, Abp. of Mahiloŭ and Mstsislaŭ
Humble IOANN, Abp. of Palessye and Berast
Humble AFANASIJ, Bp. of Viasebsk and Polatsk
Humble STSIAPAN, Bp. of Smalensk and Bransk
Humble HRYHORIJ, Bp. of Homel and Mazyr
Humble PAVEL, Bp. of Roslaŭ

Document 6

The Condition of the Smolensk Eparchy Dec. 1942 — Jan. 1944 (1954)*

A report written by Archbishop Stspiapan [Sieŭba] for Metropolitan Pantelejman [Ražnoŭski]:

Condition of the Smolensk Eparchy from 20 December 1942, the day of Bishop Stefan's [Stsiapan's] arrival there, to 1 January 1944.

The Smolensk cathedral church was opened for divine services and blessed on 1 February 1942 by Protoierei P. Before this time the cathedral had been used as a storehouse for military pieces and Protoierei P. was custodian. In 1942 the churches in Smolensk were opened: the Guz'evskaia Church as well as the Tikhvinskaia and Vsesviatskaia churches.

The following deans were assigned to open the churches of other congregations in other centers: Archimandrite P. for congregations in Roslavl', Archimandrite M. for twelve congregations in Briansk. Protoierei P. for five congregations in Mstislavl', Protoierei L. for eight in Viazma. There was one church each in the cities of Demidov, Dorogobuzh, Gzhatsk, Rzhev, and Karachev.**

Courses were open to prepare persons who agreed to serve churches in the cities of Smolensk and Karachev.

There were eparchial administrations in the cities of Mogilev and Vitebsk. Under the direction of Protoierei R. there were three congregations in Mogilev. In addition, there were deaneries in the cities. In the city of Orsha served by Protoierei V. there were ten congregations; in Shklov with seven congregations and in Borisov Protoierei S. with twenty-one congregations, and one congregation in the town of Berezino. There was also a monastery in the village of Belynichi.

In Vitebsk, the eparchial administration was under the guidance of Archimandrite M. In the city itself there were two congregations, and in the surrounding area, six. There was also a deanery in the city of Lepel' under Protoierei K. for nine congregations.

* **The Great Revival: The Russian Church under German Occupation**, by Wassilij Alexeev and Theofanis G. Stavrou, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1976, pp. 134-135. © Burgess Publishing Company, 1976. A copy of this report signed by Archbishop Stefan in March 1954 exists in W. Alexeev's personal archives.

** ...the authors have avoided using names that might implicate the priests themselves or their relatives. The full names appear on the document, however.

gations. There was a congregation and the Evfrosinievski Convent in Polotsk under Father D. On 23 May 1943 the relics of Blessed Evfrosiniia were brought to Polotsk from Vitebsk, where they had been since 1925 . . .

Cadres of the clergy were filled mainly from those who had come from former Poland and from the repressed clergy who remained in the Soviet zone. Again, persons chosen and attested by congregations, mainly former teachers, were newly consecrated.

In regard to the moral level of the clergy, thanks to the Lord, despite the burden of the war all were, as they say, in their proper place. In regard to the people, one can only say good things about them: during the establishment of congregations the people themselves, without being ordered or coerced to do so, established them, undergoing sacrifice and effort to do so. Thus, when the question of the re-establishment of Orthodoxy was raised by the German authorities, I said and I shall maintain that it would be re-established tomorrow with the arrival of some authority acceptable to the people.

There were numerous baptisms and marriages. There were general confessions of the mass of the people. In witness to the morality of the population, one must note that Russians hid Jewish children, registered them into their own families, and baptized them with their own name.

Attested: Archbishop Stefan
March 24, 1954

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Section 1: The Historical Background

- Ammann, A. M., *Abriss der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte*, Vienna, 1950.
- Bogolepov, Alexander A., *Toward an American Orthodox Church*, New York, 1963.
- Čistovič, I. A., *Očerk istorii Zapadno-Russkoj Tserkvi*, Spb. 1881.
- Čistovič, I. A., *Rukovodjaščie dejateli dukhovnago prosvetščennja v Rusii v pervoj polovine tekuščago stoletija*, Spb, 1884.
- Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**, Moscow, 1977.
- Dortel-Claudot, Michel, *Eglises locales, Eglise Universelle: Comment se gouverne l'Eglise*, Lyon, 1973.
- Golubinskij, E. E., *Istorija Russkoj Tserkvi*, vols. 1, 2, and 3, Moscow, 1901; The Hague/Paris, 1969.
- Kartašev, A. V., *Očerki po istorii Russkoj Tserkvi*, vols. 1 and 2, Paris, 1959.
- Luchterhandt, Otto, *Die Religionsgesetzgebung der Sowjetunion*, Berlin, 1978.
- Marshall, Richard H., Jr., et al., eds., *Aspects of Religion in the Soviet Union, 1917-1967*, Chicago, 1971.
- Ornatskij, A. A., *Istorija Rossijskoj Ierarxii*, vols. 1 and 2, reedited by M. Oesterby, Copenhagen, 1979.
- Smolitsch, Igor, *Geschichte der Russischen Kirche 1700-1917*, vol. 1, Leiden, 1964.
- Stammmler, Heinrich A., "Der Fall des Erzbischofs Varlaam Šišackij von Mogilev," Ulrich Haustein, ed., *Ostmitteleuropa: Berichte und Forschungen*, Stuttgart, 1981.
- Titov, A. A., "Varlaam Šišackij," *Russkij Arkhiv*, No. 6, 1903.
- Titov, F., *Russkaja Pravoslavnaja Tserkov' v Pol'sko-Litovskom Gosudarstve v XVII-XVIII vv. (1654-1795)*, vol. 1, *Zapadnaja Rus' v bor'be za veru i narodnost' v XVII-XVIII vv.*, Kiev, 1905.
- Troitskij, Sergij V., "O tserkovnoj avtokefalii," *Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarkhii*, No. 7, 1948.
- Vasiliev, A. A., *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Madison, 1952.

Section 2: The Eparchy of Minsk and its Suffragan Sees

- Curtiss, John S., *The Russian Church and the Soviet State*, Boston, 1953.
- Kasiak, I[van], *Z historyi Pravaslaunaj Tsarkvy Belaruskaha Narodu*, New York, 1956.

- [Martos], Abp. Afanasij, **Belarus' v istoričeskoj, gosudarstvennoj, i tserkovnoj žizni**, Buenos Aires, 1966.
- Nikolaj, Arkhimandrit, **Istoriko-statističeskoe opisanie Minskoj epar-khii**, St. Petersburg, 1864.
- Runkevič, Stefan, **Istorija Minskoj Arkhiepiskopii, 1793-1832**, St. Petersburg, 1893.
- Šabatin, I., "Iz istorii vossoedinenija belorusskikh uniatov," **Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarkhii**, Nos. 10 and 11, 1951.

Section 3: Autocephaly: The First Attempt (1922)

- Kasiak, I., **op. cit.**
- [Martos], Abp. Afanasij, **op. cit.**
- Teodorovich, Nadezhda, "The Belorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church," in **Genocide in the USSR: Studies in Group Destruction**, Nikolai K. Deker and Andrei Lebed, eds., New York, 1958.

Section 4: The Renovationist Schism in Byelorussia

- Anderson, Paul B., **People, Church and State in Modern Russia**, New York, 1944.
- Bociurkiw, Bohdan R., "The Renovationist Church in the Soviet Ukraine, 1922-1939," **The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., Inc.**, vol. 9, nos. 1-2 (27-28), 1961.
- Curtiss, John S., **op. cit.**
- Fedotov, George P., **The Russian Church since the Revolution**, New York, 1928.
- Larin, Abp. Sergij, **Obnovlenčeskij Raskol**, Unpublished dissertation, Astrakhan'-Moscow, 1953-59.
- St. John, Henry, "Introduction," Peter F. Anson, **Bishops at Large**, London, 1964.
- Šiškin, A[lexandr] A., **Suščnost' i kritičeskaja otsenka "obnovlen-českogo" raskola Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi**, Kazan', 1970.
- Titlinov, B. V., **Tserkov' vo vremja revoljutsii**, Petrograd, 1924.
- Troitsky, S., "The Living Church," W. C. Emhardt, **Religion in Soviet Russia: Anarchy**, Milwaukee, 1929.
- Vestnik Svjaščennogo Sinoda Pravoslavnykh Tserkvey v SSSR**, Moscow, 1926-1928.

Section 5: Autocephaly: The Second Attempt (1927)

- [Martos], Abp. Afanasij, **op. cit.**
- Kaval', Prakop, **Bieluarś u datakh i faktakh**, Paris, 1953, (2nd ed.), revised and enlarged.

Section 6: The Orthodox Church in Poland (1921-1980)

- Aleksij, Abp., *K istorii Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi v Pol'she za 10-tiletnee prebyvanie vo glave Ee Blažennejšego Mitropolita Dionisija (1923-1933)*, Warsaw, 1937.
- Korowytsky, I[van], "The Orthodox Church in Poland," *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia*, vol. 2, Volodymyr Kubijovič, ed., Toronto, 1971.
- Orthodox Eastern Church in Poland: Past and Present*, The, London, 1942.
- "Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church," *Christian Social Association Information Bulletin*, No. 3, Warsaw, 1972.
- Strakhovsky, Leonid I., "The Church in Contemporary Poland (1919-1930)," *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 18, no. 3, 1932.
- Suchenek-Sucheki, Henryk, *Państwo a Cerkiew Prawosławna w Polsce i w Państwach Ościennych*, Warsaw, 1930.
- Svitič, Aleksandr, *Pravoslavnaja Tserkov' v Pol'she i ee avtokefalija*, Buenos Aires, 1959.

Section 7: Patriarchal Jurisdiction Reestablished in Byelorussia (1939-1940)

- Alexeev, Wassilij, *Russian Orthodox Bishops in the Soviet Union, 1941-1953: Materials for the History of the Russian Orthodox Church in the U.S.S.R.*, New York, 1954.
- Dallin, Alexander, *German Rule in Russia 1941-1945: A Study of Occupation Policies*, London/New York, 1981. 2nd edition.
- Fletcher, William C., *A Study in Survival: The Church in Russia 1927-1943*, London, 1965.
- Heyer, Friedrich, *Die orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine von 1917 bis 1945*, Cologne, 1953.
- Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarkhii*, September 1943- , passim.

Section 8: Autocephaly: The Third Attempt (1942)

- Alexeev, Wassilij and Theofanis G. Stavrou, "Belorussia," in *The Great Revival: The Russian Church under German Occupation*, Minneapolis, 1976.
- Dallin, Alexander, *op. cit.*
- Fireside, Harvey, *Icon and Swastika: The Russian Orthodox Church under Nazi and Soviet Control*, Cambridge, 1971.
- Kasiak, I., *op. cit.*
- [Martos], Abp. Afanasij, *op. cit.*

Section 9: The BAOC in the Emigration (1948-1980)

Anonymous, "Karotki narys z dziejnasci belaruskae autokefal'nae pravaslaunae tsarkvy na emihratsyui, **Holas Tsarkvy**, No. 50, Dec. 1978.

Heyer, Friedrich, **op. cit.**

Kasiak, I[van], **op. cit.**

[Martos], Abp. Afanasij, **op. cit.**

[Surrency], Archimandrite Serafim, **The Quest for Orthodoxy in America: A History of the Orthodox Church in North America**, New York, 1973.

Vakar, Nicholas P., **Belorussia: The Making of a Nation**, Cambridge, 1956.

Vinitski, Ales', **Matar'jaly da historyi belaruskaj emihratsyi u Njameč-čyne u 1939-1951 hh., častka II: Relihijnyja spravy**, Los Angeles, 1968.

THE TEACHING OF THE BYELORUSSIAN LANGUAGE IN AN ENGLISH-SPEAKING MILIEU

Valentyna Pashkivich

The Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences

An important aspect of the effort by any ethnic community to establish itself in its new place of settlement is making provision for its cultural self-maintenance and, more specifically, to assure the retention of its language in the minds and mouths of the younger generation. These goals are achieved primarily through the use of language in the home but equally if not more important is the institutionalization of the language in the community through the creation of schools and the publishing of suitable textbooks for use in these schools.

In the case of Byelorussions in North America, teachers in each community undertook the difficult task of organizing and teaching in Saturday schools where, predictably, they quickly encountered problems attendant on such an enterprise.

In the early stages of their education after arriving in a new land, the main problem facing the children of Byelorussian immigrants was learning English rather than Byelorussian, the language in which they were already more or less fluent. Consequently, it was relatively easy to teach them to read and write Byelorussian from textbooks brought from the Mother Country. It was also simple to teach them to sing Byelorussian songs and to perform plays in Byelorussian, an activity which children generally enjoy.

However, serious problems remained. The major one, perhaps, was the scarcity of Byelorussian textbooks, especially of elementary readers and primers. This problem had to be dealt with by each teacher individually and, curiously, it was quite a long time before any Byelorussian cultural or political organization gave serious consideration to this matter.

Teachers were left to their own resources and imagination to find solutions. Some resorted to the use of primers published in Soviet Byelorussia, an obviously unsatisfactory solution. The material contained in these books was unacceptable not only from an ideological standpoint — even the most elementary texts contain both Communist and russifying propaganda — but more importantly, because the orthography and language used in these

books were based on the Soviet reforms of the Byelorussian language which occurred in 1933 and 1957. Among the reasons for those reforms, as indicated by Soviet writer Aleksandr Kryvicki in his recently published brochure *U rytmie z razvićciom movy* (In the Rhythm of the Development of the Language, 1976) was to reduce or eliminate altogether the differences between Byelorussian and Russian orthography, among other goals (p. 55). As a result of the implementation of these reforms of the language, the Byelorussian language used in official Soviet publications and school textbooks often bears a closer resemblance to bad Russian than to good Byelorussian.

This brief digression is intended to explain why the use of textbooks published in Byelorussia remains unfeasible and why it is necessary to publish our own.

The need very soon became apparent to the teachers in Byelorussian Saturday schools and a number of them proceeded on their own to compile and publish Byelorussian readers, grammars, and history texts.

In 1958 the Byelorussian school in Chicago published its first book, a reader for the second grade, **Čytanka: Padručnik da čytańnia dla klasy II**, compiled by a teacher of that school, Vaclaŭ Panucevič.

In 1959 the same school published a reader for the first grade, **Pieršaja čytanka**, also by Mr. Panucevič. Both books are illustrated and feature carefully selected, interesting materials. Unfortunately, due to a shortage of funds, they were reproduced on a Gestetner copier. The small letters of the typewriter were difficult to read, especially for younger children, but these books were, nevertheless, a significant contribution to pedagogical materials available at that time.

In 1961 an important development in the field of Byelorussian textbook publication occurred when the Parish Committee of the Byelorussian Orthodox Church of St. Eŭfrasinia of Polatsk in South River, New Jersey photocopied a sufficient number of copies of the Byelorussian primer by A. Radkievič, **Bielaruski lemantar**, to meet their own requirements, with enough copies in addition to supply other Byelorussian schools. Originally published in Munich, Germany in 1946, this book was compiled by Apalonia Savionak, a teacher in the Byelorussian public school in the Michelsdorf Displaced Persons Camp. It continues in all respects to be adequate for use in Byelorussian schools today.

During that same year the primary reader, **Bielaruskaja škola: pieršaja paśla lemantara kniha dla čytańnia**, compiled and published in Riga, Latvia, in 1926 by Kanstantin Jezavitaŭ, a teacher in the Byelorussian secondary school in Riga, was also photocopied and distributed, once again in South River. This decision was much less fortunate. The contents of the textbook, in-

tended for and suitable for Byelorussian rural schools in 1926, was, by 1961, anachronistic even in Byelorussia; it could hardly be of any practical use in North America.

A similar fate befell another textbook, this one a newly-released primer, **Lemantar dla školaŭ i chatniaha navučańnia**, compiled and published in New York in 1964 by Jazep Hladki, a retired Byelorussian teacher who had had many years of teaching experience in Byelorussia and was subsequently named the principal of the Byelorussian elementary school in the Watenstedt Displaced Persons Camp in Germany. This seasoned pedagogue surmised that for children attending English-language schools, the Latin alphabet would be easier to cope with as they learned Byelorussian. Thus two-thirds of the book is written in the Latin alphabet; and one-third in Cyrillic. Even this might have been acceptable if the contents of the book had not been of a nature similar to that of the 1926 Riga reader. For predictable reasons, this book was not widely adopted or used.

However, before long new difficulties and problems arose. Students born in North America during this period numbered many with a very limited knowledge of Byelorussian; a good many were children of mixed marriages. The small Byelorussian-English vocabularies supplied in the Pashkievich reader were woefully insufficient and the stories in the reader too difficult for this group of pupils to understand, containing, as they did, too many unknown words. The need emerged for bilingual textbooks which would contain extensive Byelorussian-English vocabularies.

To fill this need V. Pashkievich began to work on such a textbook with the hope that funds for its publication would be

From 1966 to 1968 publishing activities in the field of Byelorussian language textbooks were undertaken by an enthusiastic younger teacher, Jurka Stankievič, an engineer by profession, who was teaching in the Byelorussian Saturday schools in New York and Cleveland. In 1966 he compiled and published a language textbook for the second grade, **Padručnik bielaruskaje movy dla druhoje klasy: Pravapis i razvićcio movy**. This provided, at long last, a much-needed textbook of Byelorussian orthography. He also worked on a reader, a small portion of which was released in 1966. When the writer volunteered to compile a reader, Stankievič discontinued work on his and turned instead to the preparation of a Byelorussian history textbook. As a result of these decisions, **Pieršaja čytanka pašla lemantara** (A First Reader for Use after the Primer) by Valentyna Pashkievich, a teacher in the Byelorussian Saturday school in Toronto; and **Karotki ahlad historyi Bielarusi** (A Brief Review of the History of Byelorussia) by P. Rahach, a pseudonym of Jurka Stankievič, both appeared in the course of 1968.

**
*

However, before long new difficulties and problems arose. Students born in North America during this period numbered many with a very limited knowledge of Byelorussian; a good many were children of mixed marriages. The small Byelorussian-English vocabularies supplied in the Pashkievich reader were woefully insufficient and the stories in the reader too difficult for this group of pupils to understand, containing, as they did, too many unknown words. The need emerged for bilingual textbooks which would contain extensive Byelorussian-English vocabularies.

To fill this need V. Pashkievich began to work on such a textbook with the hope that funds for its publication would be found. The founder of the Byelorussian Institute of Arts and Sciences in Canada, Dr. Vincent Žuk-Hryškievič, had, in the meantime, succeeded through his own energetic efforts and with the collaboration of the Byelorussian Institutes of Arts and Sciences in both Canada and the United States, in establishing the Byelorussian Textbook Publication Fund. Thanks to the two Institutes, which contributed significant academic assistance; to the Byelorussian communities of both countries which provided generous financial support; and most of all, thanks to the Canadian Federal Government which — in response to an application by the Byelorussian-Canadian Coordinating Committee—granted \$15,000 for the implementation of this project, **Fundamental Byelorussian/Bielaruskaja mova, Book 1**, compiled by Valentyna Pashkievich and edited by Professor Anthony Adamovich, was published in 1974. 1977 was the projected publication date for **Book 2**.

Fundamental Byelorussian presents texts for reading, supplemented by vocabularies appropriate to each story or dialogue, rules of Byelorussian phonetics and morphology given in both Byelorussian and English, as well as exercises for written and oral work. In addition, both volumes provide Byelorussian-English and English-Byelorussian vocabularies, which, it was hoped, would be sufficiently extensive to allow even a beginner in the study of the Byelorussian language to make full use of the texts. An important feature for students born outside of Byelorussia is that the stress is indicated on all Byelorussian words, reducing the possibility of error.

**
*

In reviewing this short account of the history of Byelorussian textbook publication in North America, it can be seen that despite each of these projects having been individually initiated, the resulting publications effectively complemented one another. None

was a repetition of material covered in any previous book; on the contrary, each one introduced something new and necessary, giving the impression that joint planning and coordination had taken place. This indicates that the task of compiling the textbooks was undertaken by individuals involved in the teaching enterprise, who understood the problem involved and had the professional experience to deal effectively with them.

Had all these efforts been coordinated or planned more extensively, they would unquestionably have led to even better results. Certain errors might have been avoided and certain shortcomings might have been corrected. However, since formal cooperation was, in fact, absent — indeed, it was, to a large extent, impossible — the results of the individual initiatives which were taken have been very fortuitous.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hladki, Jazep. **Lemantar dla školau i chatniaha navučańnia**. New York, 1964.

Jezavitau, Kanstantin. **Bielaruskaja škola, pieršaja pašla lemantara: Kniha dla čytańnia**. Riga, 1926.

Kryvicki, Aleksandr. **U rytmie z razvićciom movy**. Minsk, 1976.

Panucevič, Vaclau. **Čytanka: Padručnik da čytańnia dla klasy II**. Chicago, 1958.

Panucevič, Vaclau. **Pieršaja čytanka**. Chicago, 1959.

Paskievič, Valentyna. **Pieršaja čytanka pašla lemantara**. Toronto, 1968.

Paskievič, Valentyna. **Fundamental Byelorussian, Book 1**. Toronto, 1974.

Radkevič, Apolonia. **Bielaruski lemantar**. Munich, 1948.

Rahač, P. **Karotki ahlad historyi Bielarusi**. Cleveland-New York, 1968.

Stankevič, Jurka. **Čytanka dla druhoje klasy**. New York, 1966.

Stankevič, Jurka. **Padručnik bielaruskaje movy dla druhoje klasy: Pravapis i razvićcio movy**. New York, 1966.

BYELORUSSIAN STUDIES IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF MARYLAND

Vasil Melianovich
East European Academic Association of Maryland

It would be accurate to say that the notion of "Byelorussian Studies" is a new phenomenon in the American curriculum. However, to put the question in context, it must be admitted that Slavic Studies generally have not been included in the programs of very many American school systems. The causes for this state of affairs are numerous, not by any means clear at this time, and more to the point, insufficiently researched.

Mildred Dickeman deals with this question in her provocative article, "Teaching Cultural Pluralism" in the volume entitled *Teaching Ethnic Studies* (43rd Year Book, 1973). She says:

American schools are racist by design. Their racism is part of a larger philosophy, an ethnocentric dedication to the remodeling of citizens to conform to a single homogenous acceptable model.

She goes on to posit that it is the schools' function to select from the lower-level ranks individuals who "possessed adequate loyalty and sufficient conformity in attitudes, values, behavior, and appearance to be adopted into the expanding middle class." She continues:

Individuals do not have equal access to the opportunities and rewards of American society. And the prime reason for this is that our society does not treat individuals as such but primarily and initially as members of ethnic groups. The classification and ranking in which this society engages is essentially on the basis of group characteristics, both biological and cultural, which determine initial placement in a hierarchy of classes and castes.

The content of the curriculum, in cooperation with many other parts of the school system, carries out the two major functions of schools, inculcating in the majority of its pupils an acceptance of the American social system, building into them enough allegiance that they will take their places in the employed and employable lower classes as loyal and manipulable citizens, and selecting for upward mobility those few who are acceptable and needed, those "outstanding exceptions" who will be pointed out as demonstrations of the validity of the school's ideology.

One of the most significant points which she makes in her

article deserves special consideration, viz., that "The school demands of the pupil a denial of his heritage if he is to succeed in American terms."

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education issued a significant Multicultural Statement in 1971, one which deviated markedly from the long-held views of the profession. It read: "Multicultural education is education for cultural pluralism. It implies a realization that the long-cherished melting pot theory is a myth, and it recognizes cultural diversity as a fact of life in American society."

The Public School Laws of the State of Maryland (1970 Supplement) includes the statement that "All public schools shall include in their programs of studies, either as a part of current curricular offerings or as separate courses, appropriate instruction for developing understanding and appreciation of ethnic and cultural minorities."

Keeping the foregoing in mind, let us now consider Byelorussian and other Slavic studies as they currently exist in the State of Maryland.

Various records chronicling education in the state indicate that attempts made over the years to introduce the systematic study of Slavic themes and courses at the secondary and college levels have not met with much success. Granted these efforts on the part of individual teachers have been modest, sporadic, and uncoordinated. The operative fact is that the educational authorities disapproved of and discouraged these attempts.

Because of this pattern, a group of Americans of Byelorussian, Slovak, and Ukrainian descent formed the East European Academic Association of Maryland in 1973. The objectives of the Association were:

1. The promotion of East European studies in the schools, colleges, and universities.
2. The eventual development of an ethnic/cultural resource center for Maryland.
3. The development of a comprehensive list of resource personnel and scholars; and the compilation of ethnic bibliographies.
4. The promotion of the role of ethnic communities in the media.
5. The fostering of cooperation with other groups which promote ethnic affairs.

Since most of the Association's active membership consists of persons of Slavic descent, the Association's agenda understandably focused on addressing questions and problems relating to those ethnic groups. The group remains responsive, however, to matters of concern to other East European nationalities.

Since its formation the East European Academic Association

can record some achievements in the area of advancing the interests of Slavic-Americans in the State of Maryland.

Meetings have been held between the State Superintendent of Maryland State Department of Education, Dr. J. A. Sensenbaugh, and representatives of the Byelorussian, Slovak, and Ukrainian communities. Specific complaints were made and concrete proposals and recommendations were also offered. These discussions proved to be quite fruitful and as a result, the Maryland State Department of Education issued a directive, **Guidelines for the Evaluation and Selection of Instructional Materials which will Insure Proper Recognition of Ethnic and Cultural Minorities**. While these **Guidelines** identify the Black Americans and Native Americans ("American Indians") as groups which present outstanding problems at the present time, their general nature covers other ethnic groups as well. Their basic purpose is to provide criteria for the evaluation and selection of classroom materials. In general, it can be said that the dialogue with the State Department of Education has produced an improved climate where greater attention is paid to the Slavic peoples in television series on ethnic groups, in the selection of books, and in developing course content.

Owing to this new state of affairs, it has become easier for individual teachers to obtain permission to offer courses and seminars, give lectures of subjects previously ignored and unfunded, and integrate in a more natural way this information which makes up such an important segment of American history and sociology.

At Harford Community College a course has been introduced on Polish history. In Essex Community College courses have been given on Polish and Ukrainian history and language. At Towson State University a course on ethnicity is being offered which includes some Slavic groups.

A kind of cross-fertilization has also taken place within the Slavic community, with Byelorussians participating in Polish and Ukrainian functions and they in ours. Lectures, seminars, and study units on Byelorussian history, language, culture (including music and literature) are periodically offered in several high schools and community colleges.

Thanks to the efforts of Professor Paul Fenchak, ■ specialist in Eastern Europe, courses on Eastern Europe are part of the curriculum at Pikesville Senior High School, one of the outstanding secondary schools in the state. This school has produced a series of tapes entitled "International Perspectives... Sounding Out Our Ethnic Americans." These tapes and ancillary materials are used by the honors social studies classes. Various nations, including Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Ukraine have been assigned as study projects and term-paper themes as well as being regularly included in class discussions.

An article in the **Baltimore Evening Sun** for December 4, 1935 included the following data:

The official census for Baltimore is a curious, intensely interesting document, both for what it reveals and for what it leaves out. It lists some 14,000 non-existing Russians...

Foreign-born residents are listed in twenty-two nationality groups, from the large German, Polish, and Italian figures down to the smallest number: 201 Welshmen.

Other very small nationality groups scattered about the city are difficult to know.

Although the Byelorussians are not mentioned in this news analysis by R. P. Harris, there is considerable proof that a large percentage, perhaps even the majority of those so-called "Russians" were in fact Byelorussians, called "White Russians" at that time. The adjective was dropped and the Byelorussians came registered as simply "Russians."

Regrettably, the last official Federal Census did not differ in any important particular from the Baltimore Census of 1935. The problem, indeed the fallacy, of this survey lies in its very design. It was put together by persons who had little if any background in the demographics or politics of Eastern Europe.

The most effective way to bring Byelorussian Americans into the consciousness of their fellow Americans is for those of ability to make concrete efforts to include references to the country and its people, in the homeland and abroad, in their own work, wherever that is possible. This will, of course, require patience, persistence, inventiveness, and for optimum results, professional achievement.

The teacher of music should include repertoire from Byelorussia in the curriculum he devises. The historian who writes a high-school textbook has every right and opportunity to present a balanced account of Eastern Europe which includes Byelorussian events, persons, and movements. Any artist or performer must seek ways to include material with Byelorussian roots or background in his or her creative work.

A more systematic effort must be made to seek publicity for the celebration of Byelorussian holidays, especially, for example, the anniversary of the founding of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

An elementary-school teacher of Byelorussian background should organize a "Celebrate Your Roots Day" and give the pupils the opportunity to tell one another where their families come from. She/he can make sure that the Slavic backgrounds are sorted out and properly identified.

The most natural way to call attention to Byelorussians is to seek logical places to mention them and their accomplish-

ments. Attempts to pressure or force people who haven't paid attention to do so are apt to be counterproductive; such moves can stimulate a negative kind of recognition and evaluation.

One of the community's greatest needs is a novelist who can do for the Byelorussians what Taylor Caldwell has done for the Irish (in **Captains and the Kings**), Howard Fast for the Italians (in **The Immigrants**) or Michael Arlen for the Armenians (in **Passage to Ararat**). One good yarn on the best-seller list for a year can do far more than can possibly be accomplished by all the indignant attempts in the world to force government agencies or educators to do something they don't understand or don't take seriously.

ПОЛЬСКІ ЗАМЕЖНЫ ДРУК ПРА БЕЛАРУСЬ

Уладзімер Брылеўскі
Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва

Польскі эміграцыйны друк у большыні ставіцца да беларускага нацыянальнага руху, да беларушчыны наагул, а да справы беларускай дзяржаўнай незалежнасці асабліва, калі не варожа, дык усё-ж няпрыхільна. Асабліва няпрыхільныя эндэцкія часапісы зь лёнданскай газэтай “Myśl Polska” на чале, часапісы партыі польскіх нацыяналістых — Polskie stronictwo Narodowe, да якое належаць галоўна былыя абшарнікі, частка інтэлігенцыі й большыня польскага духавенства. Згодна з сваёй традыцыйнай палітыкай да беларусаў і ўкраінцаў, эндэкі ня хочуць бачыць паміж Польшчай і Расеяй вольных і незалежных Беларусі й Украіны. Яны й сяньня трымаюцца паглядаў свайго лідара й ідэялёга першае палавіны XX ст. Рамана Дмоўскага, які арыентаваўся на Расею.

Для эндэкаў усходні сусвет Польшчы гэта Расея, а не Беларусь і Украіна. Беларусы і ўкраінцы паводле іх не народы, якія жывуць на сваёй нацыянальнай тэрыторыі, а толькі нацыянальныя мяншыні на „ўсходніх польскіх” землях. І таму эндэкі хочуць дагаварыцца з Расеяй іхным коштам. Асабліва варожа настаўлены адзін зь дзеячоў гэтае партыі, ведамы шавініст і маньякальны антымасон і антысэміт. Енджэй Гіртых, рэдактар часапісу “Oroka”, негаворачы пра публіцыстых з былога O.N.R. — Obóz Narodowo-Radykalny — партыі польскіх фашыстаў-антысэмітаў, перадваенны лідар якое, Баляслаў Пясэцкі, зьяўляецца цяпер кіраўніком каталіцкай арганізацыі РАХ у Польшчы ды выслужваецца там перад камуністычным рэжымам.

Ня выказвае прыхільнасці, мякка кажучы, і “Dziennik Polski”, а навет тыднёвік “Wiadomości”, прадаўжальнік міжваенных варшаўскіх “Wiadomości literackie”, часапіс польскай інтэлектualьнай эліты. Усе гэтыя часапісы выходзяць у Ангельшчыне, у Лёндане. Падобнае становішча польскіх часапісаў і ў іншых краях, прыкладам адзінага ў Заходняй Нямеччыне “Ostatnie wiadomości”, двухтыднёвіка, што выходзіць у Мангайме, ды “Tygodnik Polski”, які выдаецца ў Аўстраліі, у Мэльбурне.

Вышэй названыя часопісы й польскія замежныя публіцысты (нацыяналісты эндэкі й пілсудчыкі) хоць ідэялягічна розняцца, у вадным згодныя: усе яны не прызнаюць цяперашняй польскай усходняй дзяржаўнай мяжы ды дамагаюцца „звароту” заходніх беларускіх і ўкраінскіх земляў зь Вільняй і Львовам па былую мяжу да 17 верасня 1939 г. ды адначасна хочуць захаваць для Польшчы на захадзе былыя нямецкія землі, г. зв. „звернутыя землі”, што былі далучаныя да Польшчы па Другой Сусветнай вайне. Некаторыя з польскіх вялікадзяржаўнікаў мрояць навет пра далучэнне да Польшчы Менску й Кіева.

Праўда, сярод прыхільнікаў польскага экзыльнага ўраду, у які ня ўваходзяць эндэкі, ёсць публіцысты, якія адважваюцца выказваць думку, што паляком неабходна пагадзіцца з сучаснай усходняй мяжой Польшчы, каб не рабіць ворагамі сваіх усходніх суседзяў — беларусаў, летувісаў і ўкраінцаў — але такіх даслоўна адзінкі. Іншыя, якія думаюць падобна, не адважваюцца пра гэта пісаць. Большыня-ж пілсудчыкаў і прыхільнікаў экзыльнага ўраду ня супроць г. зв. „прамэтэйскай” праграмы вызвалення народаў, але пад умовай, што Вільня й Львоў будуць „звернутыя” Польшчы.

Адзіны бадай часопіс, які прыхільна ставіцца да справы незалежнасці ўсходніх суседзяў Польшчы, у гэтым ліку й Беларусі, гэта парыскі мясячнік “Kultura”, найпаважнейшы польскі часопіс на Захадзе. Ведамы польскі публіцысты Ежы Стэмповскі (ужо нябожчык, памёр у 1969 г.) пад псеўдонімам Павел Гостовец надрукаваў у “Kultury”, нр. 4, 1968, артыкул-успаміны пра ўкраінскага паэта й эсэіста Аўгена Маланюка, у якім пісаў:

„Чарвякоў, тагачасны (у часе падпісвання ў 1921 г. ў Рызе польска-савецкага трактату — Ул. Б.) старшыня беларускага рэвкому ў Менску, пазьнейшы прэзідэнт Беларускай Рэспублікі, які скончыў жыццё ў 1936 годзе самагубствам, падчас майго зь ім спаткання ў Рызе, на другі дзень пасля падпісання перамір’я, якое падзяліла Беларусь між Расеяй і Польшчай, так сфармуляваў іхныя спадзяванні (ход тут пра беларусаў і ўкраінцаў, якія пасля польска-бальшавіцкай вайны ў 1920 г. апынуліся пад Польшчай — Ул. Б.):

— Страшны лёс краю падзеленага чужымі дзяржавамі. Найлепш гэта ведаюць палякі. Аднак гэтая сытуацыя ў цяперашнюю хвіліну пакідае некаторую надзею. Шмат залежыць ад таго, што палякі зрабяць на сваёй частцы Беларусі, ад іхнай нацыянальнай палітыкі. Масква ня зможа адмовіцца даць нам тых свабодаў, якімі будуць карыстацца беларусы у Польшчы.

Гэтымі словамі Чарвякоў фармуляваў ня толькі спадзя-

ванні беларусаў, але таксама й палякаў. Карыстаючыся свабодамі, хоць-бы ў рамах Савецкага Саюзу, Украіна й Беларусь былі-б для Польшчы лепшай зарукай бясьпекі, чымся папяровыя пакты аб неагрэсіі. Якую ўрэшце будучыню магла мець маральна адізіяваная „вялікадзяржаўная Польшча” паміж двума наймагутнейшымі палітычнымі сіламі кантыненту?

Глухія на голас здоровага розуму, засьлепленыя нацыяналізмам, палякі дваццацігодзьдзя не апраўдалі чужых і сваіх уласных спадзяваньняў”.

Нядаўна памерлы перадавы публіцыст „Культуры”, які вызначаў палітычную лінію гэтага часопісу, Юліюш Мерашэўскі, выпрацаваў палітычную канцэпцыю ў дачыненьнях да ўсходніх суседзяў Польшчы. У артыкуле „Польская „Остпалітыка” ” („Культура”, нр 6/309, 1973), крытыкуючы палітыку эндэкаў, пілсудчыкаў і г. зв. „замку”, ці бо польскага экзыльнага ўраду і колаў зь ім зьвязаных, Ю. Мерашэўскі пісаў:

„Мы не выбіраем паміж г. зв. прамэтэйскай праграмай (праграмай пілсудчыкаў — Ул. Б.) і праграмай гутарак з Саватамі (праграма эндэкаў, якія ў свой час шьвярнуліся з „Адкрытым лістом” да Хрушчова — “Horyzonty”, нр 43, 1959 — Ул. Б.), бо такога выбару ня маем. Мы — за праграму вызваленьня паняволеных Расей народаў не дзеля рамантызму, але таму, што іншага шляху перад намі няма *de facto* ня было”.

Аналізуючы ўсходнюю палітыку эндэкаў, бальшыня якіх уважае, што прамэтэйскую праграму трэба адкінуць, як фікцыйную, і спадзявацца, што надыйдзе пара, калі Расея будзе зацікаўленая ў шчырым пагадненьні з Польшчай, Мерашэўскі пісаў:

„Асабліва небясьпечным мне выглядае прынцыповы зыходны пункт гэтай праграмы, а менавіта, што трэба шукаць пагадненьня з валадарамі Расеі не зважаючы на іхнюю сацыяльна-палітычную ахварбоўку”.

І далей: „Яшчэ цяжэй зразумець „Остполітык” пілсудчыкаў і г. зв. „замку”. Гэтыя паны рэпрэзэнтуюць перадваены кліч: „Не аддамо аніводнага гузіка!” Сябры гэтага лягеру прамэтэйскую праграму разумеюць як праграму разьбіцьця Савецкага Саюзу, а не вызваленчую палітыку для ўкраінцаў, летувісаў і беларусаў. Скарочваньне прамэтэйскай праграмы да новага варыянту польскай мяншыннай палітыкі зьяўляецца найбольш пэўным шляхам да перамены ўкраінцаў, летувісаў і беларусаў у ворагаў Рэчыпаспалітае”.

„Першым пунктам польскай усходняй палітыкі павінна быць прызнаньне права на самавызначэньне й незалежнае дзяржаўнае жыцьцё ўсіх паняволеных Саватамі народаў. З

польскага гледзішча гэты пункт датычыцца да ўкраінцаў, беларусаў і летувісаў”.

„Мне вельмі балюча, што сярод нас яшчэ ёсць палітыкі, якія гатовыя весці гутаркі зь імперыялістычнай Масквой панад галовамі й коштам братніх народаў. Балюча, што існуюць на эміграцыі групы, якія мёртвы легалізм межаў з 1939 году ставяць вышэй, чымся імператыў адналітага дзеяння паняволеных народаў”.

У вельмі цікавым іншым артыкуле „Расейскі камплекс польскі й абшар УЛБ” (УЛБ — Украіна, Летува, Беларусь — Ул. Б. „Культура”, нр 9/324, 1974) Мерашэўскі шырака разьвівае сваю палітычную ідэю й праграму ў дачыненні да прасторы Беларусь-Летува-Украіна. Вось колькі цытатаў з гэтага артыкулу:

„Ягайлаўская ідэя толькі для нас ня мае нічога супольнага зь імперыялізмам. А для летувісаў, украінцаў і беларусаў зьяўляецца найчысьцейшай формай польскага традыцыйнага імперыялізму”.

„У Ёсходняй Эўропе — калі на гэтых землях мае калі-небудзь устабілізавацца ня толькі мір, але й свабода — няма месца на ніякі імперыялізм — ні расейскі ні польскі”.

„Украінцы, летувісы й Беларусы ў дваццатым стагодзьдзі ня могуць быць пешкамі ў гістарычнай польска-расейскай гульні”.

„Мусім шукаць кантактаў і пагадненьня з расейцамі, якія выказваюць гатоўнасьць прызнаць поўнае права на самавызначэньне ўкраінцам, летувісам і беларусам і, што таксама важна, мусім самі зрачыся раз і назаўсёды Вільні, Львова й ўсялякай палітыкі ці плянаў, накіраваных на ўстанаўленьне пры спрыяльнай кан’юнктуры нашай перавагі на Ёсходзе коштам названых вышэй народаў. Як палякі, так і расейцы, мусяць зразумець, што толькі не-імперыялістычная Расея й не-імперыялістычная Польшча мелі-б магчымасьць устанавіць і ўпарадкаваць свае ўзаемадачыненьні. Мусім зразумець, штожны імперыялізм дрэнны, як польскі, так і расейскі — як зрэалізаваны, так і патэнцыяльны, які чакае на кан’юнктуру. Украінцам, летувісам і беларусам павінна быць прызнана ў будучыні поўнае права самавызначэньня, бо гэтага вымагаюць польска-расейскія дзяржаўныя інтарэсы”.

Як Павляк у інтэрвю з Амальрыкам („Культура”, нр 9/348) ідэю Мерашэўскага аб абшары УЛБ назваў „адной з галоўных”.

Але побач з цьвярозымі, разумнымі ды да беларусаў прыязнымі артыкуламі, як вышэй прыведзеных аўтараў, „Культура” зьмяшчае часам артыкулы выяўна няпрыхільныя ды такія, якія я назваў -бы прыхільна-няпрыхільнымі. Да першых трэба залічыць два артыкулы нейкага ксяндза

Мірскага, які ў першым артыкуле „Уражаньні з СССР 1970-1973” (нр 11/314), апісваючы рэлігійнае жыцьцё каталікоў у СССР, у разьдзеле прысьвечаным Беларусі, беларускую Ашмяншчыну назваў „этнічна чыста польскай часткай Віленшчыны”, што сьветчыць пра ягоную ігнаранцыю..

Недарэчныя выказваньні пра Ашмяншчыну, і аб Беларусі наагул, не заслугоўвалі-б на ўвагу, каб ня той факт, што яны былі зьмешчаныя ў гэткім паважным часопісе, як „Культура”. І дзеля гэтага аўтар друкаванага тут артыкулу зарэагаваў лістом у рэдакцыю „Культуры”, які быў зьмешчаны як артыкул у кастрычніку 1975 г. (нр 10/337).

Ведамы польскі публіцысты Віктар Вэйнтраўб у вельмі цікавым артыкуле „Станіслаў Кот (1885-1975)”, які быў надрукаваны ў 3/342 нумары „Культуры”, пішучы пра Сымона Буднага, назваў яго мазуром, г. зн. паляком па нацыянальнасьці, праўда няўпэўнена, дапускаючы, што ён магчыма быў і „русінам з паходжаньня”. Тады аўтар друкаванага тут артыкулу, у лісьце да рэдакцыі „Культуры” (нр 10/349), кастрычнік 1976) пісаў міжіншым наступнае:

„Што праўда, дакладнае месца й дата нараджэньня Сымона Буднага няведамыя. аднак ведаем, што ён быў перадавым беларускім мысьліцелем XVI стагодзьдзя й найвыдатнейшым дзеячом Рэфармацыі на Беларусі. Жыў і пісаў свае творы пабеларуску, палацінску й папольску ў Лоску, Нясьвіжы, Хоўхле, Заслаўі, Слуцку, Клецку, Любчы, Узьдзе, Вішняве ды іншых беларускіх мясцінах Вялікага Княства Літоўскага. У 1562 годзе ў Нясьвіжы былі выдадзеныя ў беларускай мове „Катэхізіс” і „Аб апраўданьні грэшнага чалавека перад Богам” ды шэраг іншых працаў, пераважна перакладаў. Тое, што некаторыя ягоныя рэчы, прыкладам пераклад Бібліі ў польскую мову, выдадзены ў тым-жа Нясьвіжы ў 1572 годзе й пераклад Новага Завету з прадмовай і камэнтарамі (1574 г.), а таксама ведамая кніжка „Аб урадзе мяча” (1583), выдадзеныя ў Лоску, былі пісаныя папольску — так як да правадыроў Рэфармацыі на Захадзе пісаў палацінску, — зусім не даводзіць, што ён быў мазуром, бо гэтыя рэчы выдаваў галоўна для „польскіх братоў” (польскіх арыянаў), зь якімі вёў вострую палеміку і нават іх, „гэтую найрадыкальнейшую сэкту сваёй біблійнай эгзэгэзай патрапіў абурьць”. У гэтых рэчах ёсьць шмат беларусызмаў, але няма палянیزмаў у ягоных працах, што былі выдадзеныя пабеларуску. Аляксандар Брукнер у сваёй рэцэнзыі на „Zabytki literatury z doby Reformacji”, Nr 1, pod redakcją S. Kota (Reformacja w Polsce. Rocznik VI, Nr. 21-24. Warszawa, 1934, s. 262) сьцьвердзіў, што Будны сваю польскую мову (у творах пісаных папольску) надточваў „рушчынай”, і што нельга знайсці ў яго аніводнага мазурскага слоўца. Будны добра

ведаў таксама царкоўна-славянскую мову. Цяжка таму дапусьціць, што такім знаўцам мог быць мазур. Ды ўрэшце беларускае прозьвішча Будны, якое ў перакладзе на польскую азначае „будны”, не сьвяточны дзень, гаворыць само за сябе”.

Прыхільна-няпрыхільна шмат на беларускія тэмы пісаў апошнім часам у „Культуры” праф. Віктар Суканьніцкі. Ягоныя артыкулы бязумоўна ня можна параўнаць з прымітыўнымі выказваньнямі кс. Мірскага, але і ў яго здараюцца недакладнасьці, памылкі, дэфармацыі. У вадным з сваіх артыкулаў (сакавік 1975, нр 3/330) ён пісаў, што на Бэрлінскай канфэрэнцыі ў 1925 годзе органы Беларускай Народнай Рэспублікі (БНР) быццам самаліквідаваліся й перадалі свае паўнамоцтвы Савецкай Беларусі. У гэтым-жа артыкуле ён піша, што сярод беларускай эміграцыі быццам існуюць аж... чатыры ар’ентацыі, у іх ліку ар’ентацыя на... савецкую Маскву, на „единую и неделимую” і на Варшаву, а таксама, што на эміграцыі ёсьць дзьве БАПЦ. А ў артыкуле „Białoruskie rokłosie” (Nr. 5/344, 1976) В. Суканьніцкі Першы Ўсебеларускі Кангрэс назваў „вечам”. Пісьменьнік Кастусь Акула ў сваіх двух лістох да рэдакцыі „Культуры” востра зарэагаваў на гэтыя дэзінфармацыі. І аўтар гэтага тут нарысу ў лісьце да рэдакцыі таксама выправіў некаторыя памылкі, а ў адказ на артыкул „Białoruskie rokłosie” выслаў да „Культуры” ліст гэткага зьместу:

„Праф. Віктар Суканьніцкі пішучы на беларускія тэмы пачаў, як кажа ведамая расейская пагаворка, „за здравие, а кончил за упокой”.

Зусім аб’ектыўныя, на акадэмічным узроўні, рэцэнзыі на беларускія навуковыя часопісы напачатку, крыху пазьней даволі бесстароньні артыкул „Беларускае разьбіцьцё й легалізм”, не пазбаўлены аднак некаторых недакладнасьцяў і памылак, што ўрэшце зусім не паўсталі із злой волі аўтара. Не зважаючы на гэтыя недакладнасьці й памылкі, тон артыкулаў праф. Суканьніцкага быў запраўды „прынцыпова прыхільны для беларускай справы й ветлівы ў вадносінах да ўсіх ейных змагароў”, як азначыў сам Шаноўны Аўтар. Дык мне было ўзапраўды прыкра з прычыны далёкага ад ветлівасьці, вострага тону лістоў у Рэдакцыю „Культуры” (нр нр 7/334-8/335 і 11/338 майго суродзіча Кастуся Акулы, вытыкаючых некаторыя памылкі праф. Суканьніцкага. Аднак, што да апошняга ягонага артыкулу „Białoruskie rokłosie” ў травенскім (5/344) нумары „Культуры”, дык ніводзін беларус-незазлежнік ня можа не абурьцца. Акт 25 Сакавіка 1918 — Трэйцяя Устаўная Грамата — якой Рада Беларускае Народнае Рэспублікі абвесьціла поўную незалежнасьць Беларусі, ёсьць тым для ўсіх змагароў за беларускую Справу

— беларускіх патрыётаў, чым для кажнага польскага патрыёта ёсць Канстытуцыя 3 Мая, хоць і ніколі ня была ўведзеная ў жыве. Незалежнасць Беларускай Народнай Рэспублікі была прызнаная шэрагам дзяржаваў, як Украіна (УНР), Летува, Латвія, Эстонія, Фінляндыя, Грузія, Чэхаславацыя, Турцыя, Аўстрыя, Нямеччына. БНР мела свае місіі й дыпламатычныя прадстаўніцтвы ў Бэрліне, Парыжы, Капэнгагене, Бэрне, Гэльсінках, Варшаве, Празе, Коўні, Рызе, Тальліне, Канстантынопаля і ў іншых эўрапейскіх сталіцах. Але паводля праф. Суканьніцкага гэта ўсё толькі „легенды”. А тое, што Першы Усебеларускі Кангрэс, скліканы ў Менску 14 снежня 1917 году з удзелам 1872 дэлегатаў з усіх этнаграфічных частак Беларусі назваў „вечам”, зьяўляецца па меншай меры грубай нетактоўнасцю”.

У сваім іншым артыкуле-нарысе, які друкаваўся ў кнізе 38-ай кварталніка “Zeszyty historyczne”, і В. Суканьніцкі мусіў прызнаць, што на працягу апошняга паўстагоддзя, беларускі культурна-нацыянальны рух зрабіў вялізны поступ.

THE POLISH PRESS ABROAD ON BYELORUSSIA

Resumé

The Polish press abroad tends for the most part to be unfavorably disposed toward political ideas advocating Byelorussian independence and an independent Byelorussian state. Those journals which are associated politically with the ideology of the Polish National Democrats (*Endeks*) are more markedly unfavorable to such notions. That portion of the Polish establishment which is allied with the *Endeks* is not anxious to see any state located between Poland and Russia; their ideal is to share a common border with Russia and not to recognize any Byelorussian (or Ukrainian) state. This segment of the Polish establishment prefers to deal directly with the Russians, bypassing any contacts with Byelorussians or Ukrainians. Their ideas are frequently expressed in such periodicals as *Myśl Polska* (Polish Thought) *Opoka* (Bedrock), *Dziennik Polski* (The Polish Daily), *Ostatnie Wiadomości* (The Latest News), *Tygodnik Polski* (The Polish Weekly), and the weekly *Wiadomości* (News).

However, not all the above-mentioned journals adhere to the ideology of the *Endeks*; some of them follow Pilsudski's ideas. Nevertheless, they all agree on one thing: the Polish frontiers of today must be extended East to what they were in 1939, i. e., they want to include Byelorussian and Ukrainian territories,

including the cities of Vilna and L'viv. Although some outstanding Polish political leaders in the Polish Government-in-Exile have expressed the view that the Poles must agree to eastern frontiers which will not place the Byelorussians and Ukrainians in the enemy camp, but retain them as allies of Poland, such leaders are, unfortunately, not too numerous.

To the credit of the Polish establishment, the Poles also sponsor the journal **Kultura**, the most authoritative and significant Polish-language journal published outside Poland. This monthly has for many years published articles favorable to Byelorussian ideas and to Byelorussian matters in general. Many of the articles published have been of high scholarly quality, written by such distinguished authors as Juliusz Mieroszewski, Wiktor Weintraub, Wiktor Sukiennicki, and others. These authors, after analyzing and critiquing the attitudes and political views of Pilsudski's followers and the **Endeks** toward Byelorussians, have expressed the opinion that the main thrust of Polish policy toward the eastern regions should be that of recognizing the right to self-determination and statehood of all the captive nations. The nations in this category of primary importance to Poland are Byelorussians, Lithuanians, and Ukrainians. Another important feature of **Kultura's** editorial policy is that the journal provides room for the expression of Byelorussian views and even political ideas. Over the years a number of Byelorussian authors have contributed to its pages. (The most regular Byelorussian contributor to **Kultura** in recent years is the author of this article. — Ed.) The editors, being well educated and broad-minded persons, also allow room for the expression of ideas which are unfavorable to Byelorussians; this, in turn, generates discussion and, upon occasion, even polemics.

РЭЦЭНЬЗП

Knugotyra (7)14 (Книговедение): Франциск Скорина и некоторые вопросы развития книги в Советском Союзе (Сборник докладов научной конференции, посвященной началу книгопечатания в Литве и Белоруссии и организованной в Вильнюсе 21 ноября 1975 г.). Vilnius, 1979, 133 p.

Гэты нумар „Кнігаведы” змяшчае рэфэраты навуковае канфэрэнцыі, якая была зладжаная на Віленскім універсітэце з нагоды 450-годзьдзя ад выходу ў 1525 г. ў Вільні Скарынавага „Апостала”. Усе матар’ялы канфэрэнцыі надрукаваныя ў расейскай мове.

З адзінаццацёх рэфэратаў зборніка, 6 датычыць да др. Скарыны. Першы зь іх, гэта артыкул бібліятэкара-кнігаведа, дацэнта Віленскага ўніверсітэту й рэдактара зборніка Л. І. Владыміраваса: „Францыцішак Скарына — віленскі першадрукар”. Артыкул дае агляд важнейшых мамэнтаў ды нявыяшчэных пытаньняў жыццяпісу доктара Скарыны й напісаны з добраю ведаю адпаведнае літаратуры, у гэтым ліку й навейшых публікацыяў беларускіх замежных аўтараў. Зьвяртае ў ім увагу становішча Владымірасава ў справе робленых у СССР намаганьняў навязаць Скарыну імя „Георгій”. Пра гэта Владыміравас кажа: „Я буду 'не мудрствуя лукаво' называць яго Францыцішкам, г. зн. тым імём, якім ён сам сябе называў ува ўсіх сваіх выданьнях і як быў названы ў 29-х архіўных дакумэнтах-арыгіналах”.

У добра напісаным артыкуле здараюцца аднак некаторыя фактаграфічныя памылкі, прыкладам, Раман Скарына быў ня „пасынкам” доктара Скарыны, а, як сын ягонага брата Івана, браценьнікам (б. 21).

Архіўную вестку пра спаленьне ў Маскве, на загад вялікага князя, кнігаў друкаванае Бібліі, зь імём Скарыны першы зьвязаў ня І. Фідлер у 1862 г. (б. 23), але ў 1888 г. І. Пэрвольф Выдатны скарыніст, прафэсар гісторыі Праскага ўнівэрсітэту, А. В. Флароўскі, „савецкім вучоным”, як яго называе аўтар (б. 22), ніколі ня быў. Гэтыя, ды падобныя іншыя недакладнасьці, не абніжаюць аднак асноўнае вартасьці артыкулу, які добра ўводзіць у важнейшыя праблемы жыцця й дзейнасьці доктара Скарыны ды раскрывае галоўныя рысы ягонага гуманістычнага сьветагляду.

Рэфэрат другі, беларускага менскага навукоўца А. Ф. Коршунава, „Да пытаньня пра пачатак кнігадруку ў Вялікім Княстве Літоўскім”, разглядае справу ўстанаўленьня году

пачатку віленскага Скарыгнавага друку. На довад таго, што друк гэты пачаўся ў 1522 г., аўтар паклікаецца на артыкул пра гэта „бібліятэкара лёнданскага музэю імя Франьцішка Скарыны” А. Надсана ў „выдаваным эмігранцкімі коламі ў беларускай мове часопісе 'Божым шляхам'”, у якім паведамленьне пра новавыяўленую ў Каралеўскай Бібліятэцы Капэнгагену Скарынавую „Падарожную кніжку” з камплетнай „Паскаліяй”.

У справе імя Скарыны Коршунаў радзіць „ня ставіць пад сумняваньне, адкуль у яго зьявілася каталіцкае імя Франьцішак ды не навязваць яму сумлеўнага й неабгрунтаванага дастатковымі аргументамі дублетнага праваслаўнага імя Георгій, якога ён нідзе й ніколі сам ня ужываў” (б. 29).

У канцы артыкулу Коршунаў дае гэтакія канкрэтныя прапановы: ладзіць пэрыядычныя навуковыя канфэрэнцыі пра Скарыну да назваць іх „Скарынінскімі чытаньнямі”; рыхтавацца да адзначэньня юбілею 500-годзьдзя ад нараджэньня Франьцішка Скарыны, які ўжо „не загарае”; камплектаваць па бібліятэках Скарынавыя выданьні ратапрынтнымі копіямі для патрэбаў навуковых і для лепшага іх захаваньня; паставіць у Вільні помнік Франьцішку Скарыну, як засноўніку „першае на сучаснай тэрыторыі СССР друкарні”. Пры канцы артыкулу публікуецца тэкст знойдзенае ў Капэнгагене часткі Скарынавае Паскаліі.

Артыкул маскоўскага аўтара Я. Л. Няміроўскага „Спадчына Франьцішка Скарыны ў савецкіх і замежных кнігасховішчах”, гэта спроба ўліку ведамых цяпер экзэмпляраў Скарынавых выданьняў у бібліятэках СССР і краёў захаду Эўропы. Аўтар налічыў іх 378, з чаго 224 выданьні праскія й 154 віленскія. Улік Няміроўскага аднак няпоўны. З дадзенае ў артыкуле табліцы відаць, прыкладам, што аўтару няведамыя 4 праскія Скарынавыя выданьні Аддзелу рукапісаў Цэнтральнае навуковае бібліятэкі АН УССР у Кіеве. Ня мінуў аўтар нагоды, каб у артыкуле не „абурьцца” на скарынаведныя публікацыі Беларускага Інстытуту Навукі й Мастацтва, як на „нацыяналістычныя”, ды выяўна за раскрываньне ў іх фактаў партыйнае забароны скарынаведнае працы ў Беларускай ССР у гадох 1930-х ды прасьледу скарыністых.

У артыкуле менскага моваведа А. І. Жураўскага „Важнейшыя асаблівасьці мовы выданьняў Франьцішка Скарыны” спроба абгрунтаваць свой пагляд — кардынальна супярэчны пагляду акадэміка Карскага — што ў мове Скарыны пераважаюць царкоўнаславянскія асаблівасьці, і яна — „беларускі варыянт царкоўнаславянскае мовы”. Аўтар пры гэтым зазначае, што „Заслуга Скарыны ў гэтым, што ў адпаведнасьці з патрабаваньнямі свайго часу, ён стварыў асаблівы тып пісьменнае мовы, аналёга якому немагчыма знайсці ў усходніх славянаў тае пары”, ды што „Прызнаньне ягонае

мовы царкоўнаславянскай ні ў якім выпадку, зразумела, ня зьніжае лінгвістычнае каштоўнасьці скарынінскіх выданьняў ды іхнага месца ў гісторыі беларускае культуры”.

У артыкуле Г. Я. Галенчанкі „Астранамічныя ведамкі ў выданьнях Францішка Скарыны”, робіцца спроба вызначыць крыніцы, зь якіх Скарына мог чэрпаць гэтыя ведамкі ды азначыць іхную дакладнасьць. Паводле аўтара, „супастава рэтраспэктыўных канонаў зацьменьняў з прагнозам Скарыны пацвярджае дакладнасьць ягоных астранамічных прадказаньняў”, хоць, у большыні выпадкаў, яны азначаныя не для Вільні, але для мэрыдыянаў цэнтральнае Эўропы. Што да крыніцы, скуль маглі быць чэрпаныя інфармацыі Скарыны пра будучыя зацьменьні сонца й месяца, на думку аўтара, гэта быў праўдападобна альманах Ёгана Штофлера.

Артыкул А. І. Анушкіна „Скарынінскія традыцыі ў віленскім кнігадруку XVI-XVII ст. ст.” толькі вельмі агульна кранае гэтае пытаньне ў дачыненні да віленскіх друкароў Пётры Мсьціслаўца, Мамоўчаў, Брацкай ды некаторых іншых. У іншых артыкулах разглядаюцца: выдавецкая прадукцыя друкарні Віленскае Акадэміі (І. С. Петраўскенэ), кнігавыдавецтва ў Беларусі ў першым трыццацігодзьдзі XIX ст. (Е. С. Умецкая), гісторыя латыскае кнігі да канца XIX ст. (А. А. Апініс) ды выданьні твораў Леніна ў Беларусі й Ліцьве.

Апублікаваныя матар’ялы канфэрэнцыі, калі ход пра скарыніяну, хоць ніякіх новых адкрыцьцяў ня прыносяць, азначаюцца аднак рачовым разглядам узьнятых паасобных скарынаведных пытаньняў, бяз частага ў СССР партыйна-публіцыстычнага падыходу да навуковых тэмаў. Адзіны вынятак — артыкул Я. Л. Няміроўскага.

Шкада, што ў зборніку не надрукаваныя пратакольныя запісы дыскусіяў канфэрэнцыі. Як з савецкіх іншых публікацыяў ведама (В мире книг”, Москва, нр. 4, 1976, с. 92-93), на канфэрэнцыі вяліся дыскусіі пра скарынаведныя працы беларускіх замежных скарыністых, канкрэтна пра публікацыі Беларускага Інстытуту Навукі й Мастацтва, ды, асабліва, пра скарынінскі зборнік Інстытуту 1970 г. “Scoriniana, 1517-1967”, і надрукаваную ў ім „Бібліяграфію скарыніяны”.

С. Брага

Натальля Арсеньнева. Між берагамі: Выбар паэзіі, 1920-1970. New York - Toronto, Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва, 1979, XL 350 б.

У кнігу паэзіі Натальлі Арсеньневай увайшлі ейныя творы за гады 1920-1970. На пачатку кнігі — кароткая даведка пра паэтэсу ў ангельскай мовы ды біяграфічна-крытычны нарыс напісаны прафэсарам Антонам Адамовічам. У канцы

— бібліяграфія твораў Натальлі Арсеньневай і літаратуры пра яе ды ейную творчасць за гады 1921- 1979, апрацаваная Зорай Кіпель. Альфабэтны паказьнік зьмешчаных у кнізе твораў дае іхны назоў і першы радок.

Кніга адчынаецца партрэтам Натальлі Арсеньневай мастака Пётры Мірановіча, а перад кожным новым разьдзелам дадзеная фатаграфія паэтка з розных пораў ейнага жыцця. Вокладка кнігі густоўна выкананая мастачкай Ірэнай Рагалевіч.

Верш „Між берагамі”, які паслужыў назовам да ўсяе кнігі й адчыняе ў ёй паэзію Арсеньневай, служыць сымбалам усяго шляху жыцця й творчасці паэтка. Выбраная для кнігі паэзія падзеленая на шэсьць разьдзелаў. Усе творы ўкладзеныя ў храналагічным парадку, калі не заўсёды па гадох, дык паслядоўна гістарычным падзеям на жыццёвым шляху паэтка.

Першы разьдзел ахоплівае творы 1920-1927 гадоў і мае назоў першага зборніка вершаў паэтка „Пад сінім небам”. Прырода, цыкль зьменаў пораў году — бязупынныя „спадарожнікі” амаль усіх вершаў гэтага разьдзелу. Перадаюць яны шумы-шорахі й хварбы прыроды, багаты сьвет ейных „пачуцьцяў” і „настрояў” ды, зьліваючыся з думкамі-марамі паэтка надаюць вершам высокую ступень шчырасьці й лірычнай прыгажосці.

Паэзія сабранай у падразьдзеле „Зачараваны кут” паэтка аддае дань народным казкам і старадаўным паданьням. Творы гэтага разьдзелу цікавыя асабліва для пытаньня пра элемэнты беларускага фальклёру ў паэзіі Арсеньневай.

Неабходна зазначыць, што першы друкаваны верш Арсеньневай, „Восень” (б. 14), перадае ўлюблёны паэткай вобраз восені, які пасля „залатою ніткаю” снуецца праз усю ейную творчасць. Паэтычны вобраз восені з поўнай сілай выступае і ў другім разьдзеле кнігі „Жоўтая восень”, у якім вершы 1927-1937 гадоў.

Разьдзел „Жоўтая восень” мае асаблівае значаньне ў творчасці паэтка зь дзвюх прычынаў: тым, што ён прадаўжае і ўзмацняе ў ёй вобраз восені, які, як адзначае праф. А. Адамовіч, „стаўся для яе найбліжэйшым, найінтымней зродненым канкрэтным увасабляльным вобразам”, ды тым, што вершы гэтага разьдзелу, якія ніколі ня былі выдадзеныя асобнаю кнігаю, былі напісаныя да пачатку вайны й ня кранутыя ўражаньнямі й перажываньнямі бурнага ваеннага часу. Вершы гэтага пэрыяду адзначаюцца глыбокім лірызмам і пацьвярджаюць тое, што прырода й ейнае хараство для Арсеньневай вялікае духовае багацьце, нявычарпальная крыніца паэтычнага натхненьня. І толькі ў вершы „Маладым

паэтам", які замякае разьдзел, Арсеньнева зыходзіць з вышыняў лірычных мараў і радкамі

Вершы вашыя пугамі б'юць людзёх,
агнявымі маланкамі паляць сумленьні.

Я-б хацела гарэць і змагацца, як вы,
разам з вамі каваць так чаканае раньне... (б. 77)

прызнае, што жыццё, беларуская нацыянальная справа, клічуць паэта да службы свайму народу.

У разьдзеле „Сягоньня” сабраныя вершы часу вайны 1941-1943 г. Паэзія гэтае пары сьветчыць яскрава, што Арсеньнева наважана й можна ўзыйшла тады на шлях нацыянальна-патрыятычнага пакліканьня. Але й цяпер, у сваіх глыбока патрыятычных вершах, паэтка ня траціць пачуцьця лірычнай вобразнасьці, а яшчэ больш узвышае й яднае прыгажосьць беларускай прыроды з пачуцьцямі нацыянальнымі. Патрыятычныя вершы Арсеньневай прасякнуты непахісным аптымізмам, а некаторыя, пачуцьцём узвышана-нацыянальнага характару, застаюцца й да сягоньня ўлюбёнымі папулярнымі песнямі. І як ня ўспомніць тут так добра вядомую кожнаму беларусу на эміграцыі патрыятычна-рэлігійную „Малітву” Арсеньневай, прынятую як нацыянальна-рэлігійны гімн „Магутны Божа”. У вершах разьдзелу „Сягоньня” нацыянальна-патрыятычны характар паэзіі Арсеньневай дасягнуў кульмінацыйнага пункту.

Наступны разьдзел — „Не астыць нам” — носіць адбітак перажываньняў часоў канчатку вайны, на эміграцыі ў Нямеччыне. Гэты разьдзел адчыняе аднаіменны верш, у якім паэтка ня схіляе галавы ў распачы й на чужыне, ня губляе нацыянальна-патрыятычнага аптымізму:

Мы усьцяж верым,
што нашыя сьцежкі ў тупік
не вядуць, так упарта чакаем сьвітаньня, —
і яно расьцьвіце... (б. 157)

Разам з аптымізмам праз усю сваю творчасць Арсеньнева застаецца глыбока лірычнай паэткай, заўсёды нязьменліва верная ўлюбёнаму вобразу восені, пра што сьветчаць і апошнія тры радкі таго-ж вершу „Не астыць нам”:

не пачуцца старымі ні сэрцам, ні цэлам,
хоць і восень ужо, й залатыя лісты
дываны залатыя па вуліцах сыцеляць. (б. 157)

Думка-надзея павароту на бацькаўшчыну праходзіць яскраваю ніткою праз усе вершы напісаныя на першым этапе эміграцыі, у Нямеччыне, прыкладам у: „Ня плачце” (б. 160),

„Бацькаўшчыне” (б. 164), „Пачакай” (б. 172), „Беларусі” (б. 179), „І сьніцца мне” з гэткімі апошнімі радкамі:

Блакiтная, далёкая Радзiма,
калiсь — штодзённы хлеб,
а сяньня — толькi сон,
мы вернемся, чакай, хай хворымi, старымi,
а вернемся!

Так дай нам Кон! (б. 182-183)

Разьдзел „На ростанях” ахоплiвае творы заакiянскае эмiграцыi. Накiнуты лёсам пераезд за акiян Арсеньнева ўспрыiмае як месца толькi асяленьня. Разьдзел пачынаецца вершамi, што адлюстроўваюць цяжкi момант разьвiтаньня зь Беларусью, беларускiх эмiгрантаў яна параўноўвае зь лiсьцём сарваны восенскiм ветрам з гальля. А да новага месца асяленьня паэтка зьвяртаецца словамi:

О, Новы Край,
як гулi
спынiўшы, хваля нас да порту прыжане,
будзь нам прытулкам цёплым i утульным,
але ня Бацькаўшчынай,
не! (б. 202)

Увесь разьдзел „На ростанях” складаецца з падразьдзелаў-цыкляў, у якiх вершы павязаныя паэтычна-фiлязафiчнай думкай i тэмамi жыцця, якiя хвалявалi душу i сэрца паэтакi. Усе вершы гэтага разьдзелу толькi ўзмацняюць раней ужо азначаны паэтычны шлях патрыятычна-нацыянальнай лiрыкi, аптымiзму, цесна павязанага вобразамi прыроды асаблiва i ўлюблёным вобразам восенi.

Цыкль „Я i жыццё” складаецца зь вершаў спалучаных роздумаў аб паэце i паклiканьнi паэты, аб жыццi i ягоных таямнiцах. У сваiх разважаньнях Арсеньнева не адыходзiць у мэтафiзычныя недасяжныя вышынi, але простымi вобразамi, бяз мэтафараў i складаных параўнаньняў, укладае ў паэтычны радок свае думкi, як, прыкладам, пра бязупынны кругаварот жыцця:

Няма нiчога, што цвiло i жыло-б аднойчы.
Няма такога, што гарэла-б толькi тут.
Каханьне, цi вясна, зь якiмi сяньня скончым —
iзноў, калi ня ў нас —
у iншых зацвiтуць. (б. 211)

Кола паэтычных роздумаў у цыклi „Я i жыццё” паэтка замыкае вершам-зваротам „Майму жыццю”, у якiм дае аналіз свайго росту i паэтычна-духовага разьвiцця на працягу

жыццёвага шляху. Верш закончаны незгасальным жадань-
нем павароту на бацькаўшчыну:

Жыццё,
ня шмат ужо дарогі,
штораз пусьцей, цямней наўкола.
Дык дай мне роднага парогу
даткнуць,
пакуль замкнецца кола! (б. 217)

У наступным падразьдзеле — „Янкі ўсьцяж зы мной” —
зьмешчана дванаццаць вершаў-ўспамінаў гадоў азначаных
радкамi:

Мяне прасьледуюць гады,
гады вагну, ахвяр і сьмерці,
ў душу уеліся, як дым,
ніяк іх з памяці ня сьцерці. (б. 218)

Кажны верш гэтага цыклю, як балючая рана, іжны
радок — цяжкі ўспамін пра вайну. Асабліва трэба адзначыць
апошні твор цыклю назовам „Акцыя”, бо па сваёй тэме ён
адзіны ўва ўсёй беларускай паваяеннай паэзіі. Гэты твор пра-
сякнуты нязьмерным болем і глыбока кранае сэрца тым, што
ўся жудасьць сьмерці бязьвінных людзей, ахвяраў гітлероў-
скай „акцыі”, глядзіць на вас вачыма дзіцяці, якое ў гэтай
крывавай сцэне, учасніўшыся за падол свае ўжо няжывое маці
гіне апошнім. Успамін пра замучанага за чалавечы род
Хрыста замыкае вобраз жудаснае „акцыі”:

Спыніла лёт лісьцё, сплыло на целаў сплёт,
і навет Ёсель сыціх, ужо ня плакаў.
І спад павек яго, хоць ён ня знаў Хрыста,
глядзеў Хрыстос з тугой нянаскаю, дзівоснай
на тых, каму зь пяску крывавага ня ўстаць,
на катаў у крыві...

слату...

і восень... (б. 225)

Наступны цыкль, „Прыйдзе час і на песьню”, прысьве-
чаны сябром паэтам. Паэзія, пакліканьне паэты — асноўны
матыў кажнага твору. Аптымізм, патрыятызм і вера ў па-
этычнае слова і тут ўсьцяж валодаюць пяром паэткі, якая
кідае заклік паэтам-сябром:

Вучы-ж прысталых дыхаць шырай,
шутаць, за Родны Край гарэць!
Імкні!

Лаві ў крылатым лёце
чар слоў, што ймглою растае...
Хай знае сьвет:
з усіх сьмяротных
іх дакранаў адно паэт! (б. 226)

Падразьдзелы „Ня зрадзім” і „На Слуцкія ўгодкі” даюць вязанку патрыятычна-нацыянальнай лірыкі з гадоў ад 1944 да 1960. І ў найгоршых жыццёвых абставінах, і ў найбольш безнадзейных часох голас Арсеньневай не заламваецца, ня губляе аптымістычна-гераічных таноў:

... не дадзём мы душы астыць.
З гэраічнай ня выйдзем ролі,
у балота ня сьхілім сыцяг,
і ня зрадзім нідзе й ніколі
ні сябе,
ні Цябе,
ні жыцця! (б. 232)

Падразьдзелы „Ледзь красавік”, „Аджытае”, „Брамы”, „Прывіды” — лірыка вясны, штодзённага жыцця і ўспамінаў. Лірыка Арсеньневай заслугоўвае на шырокі дэталёвы разгляд, на што, нажаль, не дазваляюць рамкі сыціплае рэцэнзій. Прывадзем, прыкладам, ня выбіраючы, першыя радкі першага вершу „Вясна на бруку”:

Я прынёс сюды нараніцы стары
ў калекім кошыку з далёкіх нейкіх ніваў,
паставіў пры мур, адкрыў... і закурыў
вясною шэры брук,
такой праўдзівай! (б. 245)

У гэтым простым з будзённымі дэталямі абразку дакладны дабор словаў і прэцызыійная рэалізацыя мэтафары. Арсеньнева мае здольнасьць дабіраць слова й вобраз гэтак, што за імі заўсёды думка, пачуцьцё, шчырасьць.

Прафэсар А. Адамовіч у „біяграфічна-крытычным нарысе” зазначае: „што да паэтыкі і тэхнікі вершу, у гэтым дачыненні Арсеньнева заўсёды была традыцыяналісткаю”. Згаджаючыся, што наватарства не паэтычная мэта Арсеньневай, трэба аднак сказаць, што яна, ня прымерваючыся да нейкіх гатовых узораў, тэа тканіну свае паэзіі заўсёды на ўласны лад. Уважлівы чытач бяз сумлеву адчуе спэцыфічны „арсеньнеўскі” подых ейнае паэзіі. Ён б’ець моцным струменем у вершах ейнага ўлюблёнага вобразу восені, ці ў вершы „Гэтак будзеш ты мной”, дзе поўнасьцю яднаецца зь ім ейнае паэтычнае „я”. Эпіграф да гэтага падразьдзелу можна зра-

зумець, як зварот да мэтафарычнай вобразнасьці, да радкоў вытыканых з уяўленьняў, ледзь улоўных асацыяцыяў, тонкіх духовых зрухаў. У гэтых радках адчыняецца той сьвет паэзіі, дзе рэчы маюць адметныя значэньні, дзе „з падковы нябеснай жменяю зораў сыплюцца гуфналі“, дзе „праз шчыліны ніткай цягнецца павучынаю сум густы“, дзе „рука лістом жоўтым падае... кіслай рошчынай пахне трава“.

Багацьце гэтых мэтафараў палоніць чытача, і ён паддаецца чару нязвычайных, эмацыяльна прайздзівых вобразаў. Сваімі вобразамі Арсеньнева не „сваволіць“, не „бурапеніць“. Яны служаць дасяганьню творча кульмінацыйнае мэты — канчатковаму зьяднаньню паэткі з сваім паэтычным вобразам восені.

Восень, восень, калі-ж
напалам перарэжам
мы з табой і ўцеху, і смутак упойны?
Гэтак будзеш ты мной,
з маёй смагай і жалем,
я-ж табою,
зыркою і перапялёстай.
Будуць людзі гукаць цябе проста
„Наталяй“,
а мяне клікаць „Восеняй“,
гэтак-жа проста. (б. 262-263)

У паразьдзел „Тэма вясны“ ўвайшлі пазьнейшыя вершы Арсеньневай, а сярод іх выдатныя рэлігійна-алегарычныя творы: „Радасьць“, „Каласы“, „І была там вясна“, „Тваё імя“ (б. 283-287). Яны — каштоўны паэтычны дар паэткі-выгнаньніцы сваёй радзіме. Замыкаецца падразьдзел творам „Косы“ (Слуцкая аповесьць), прысьвечаная беларускай маці, па праву адзначаная прафэсарам А. Адамовічам, як шэдэўр.

І ў апошнім разьдзеле, „Зь перакладаў“, Арсеньнева засталася паэтам высокае ступені, даючы пераклады па паэтычнай якасьці роўныя арыгіналу (мяркуючы паводле перакладаў зь Гётэ, як найбольш нам вядомых і зразумелых у арыгінале).

„Між берагамі“ — скарб багатага плёну творчага жыцьця й паэтычнай душы Арсеньневай. Гэта тое, што паэтка самадана тварыла для лепшае будучыні свае радзімы, — каштоўны дар для свае беларускае паэзіі.

В. Арэхва

ТРЭЙЦІ БЕЛАРУСКІ ФЭСТЫВАЛЬ У ЗША

21 травеня 1979 году ў Цэнтры Мастацтваў Штату Нью Джэрзі (Garden State Arts Center), адбыўся Трэйці Беларускі Фэстываль. Сваёй першай часткай праграмы, прывітальнай, Фэстываль паказаў шырыню кантактаў ды ўдзелу ў палітычна-грамадзкім жыцці краіны беларускае нацыянальнае групы. Адчитаныя былі, прысланыя для фэстывалю, колькі-дзесят прывітаньняў ад арганізацыяў і ўстановаў беларускіх, ад шмат якіх амэрыканскіх культурна-грамадзкіх ды палітычна-дзяржаўных дзеячоў, уключна з прывітаньнем з Вашынгтону, зь Белага Дому, ад прэзыдэнта Джымі Картэра.

Губэрнатар штату Нью Джэрзі, Брэндан Бэрн, адзначыў фэстываль праклямацыяй, тэкст якое гэткі:

Дзеля таго, што жыхары беларускага паходжаньня складаюць важную частку ўсяе нашае грамадзкасьці штату, ды,

Дзеля таго, што жыхары беларускага паходжаньня адзначаюць 61-я ўгодкі Беларускае Народнае Рэспублікі, не зважаючы на тое, што ў іхнай бацькаўшчыне пануе камуністычная Расея, ды,

Дзеля таго, што жыхаром беларускага паходжаньня важна з пашанай перахоўваць сваю багатую культурную спадчыну, каб ейныя асаблівасьці маглі перадавацца з пакаленьня ў пакаленьне, ды,

Дзеля таго, што новы сэзон у Цэнтры Мастацтваў Штату Нью Джэрзі ў Голмдэл сёлета пачнецца паказам беларускага мастацтва й культуры,

Дзеля гэтага, я, Брэндан Бэрн, Губэрнатар Штату Нью Джэрзі, гэтым абвешчаю

21 травеня 1979 году

ДНЁМ БЕЛАРУСКАГА ФЭСТЫВАЛЮ.

Брэндан Бэрн
Губэрнатар

Доналд Лан
Сакратар Штату

Трэці Беларускі Фэстываль, калі раўнаць яго з двума папярэднімі (гл. „Запісы”, кн. 14, 1976 г. і кн. 15, 1977 г.), адзначаўся асабліва шырокім удзелам беларускіх арганізацыяў і іхных сяброў ня толькі ў ЗША, але й з Канады краёў Эўропы, Аўстраліі. Гэтыя арганізацыі перанялі на сябе справу прапаганды ды распадажы білетаў, што забяспечыла фэстывалю аўдыторыю ў ліку каля 3000 прысутных.

Масавасць выявілася і ў арганізацыйнай структуры: у склад Фэстывальнага Камітэту ўваходзіла 85 чалавек (справздача пра фэстываль ды сьпіс арганізацыяў і склад Камітэту пададзеныя ў газэце „Беларус”, нр. 266, чэрвень 1979 г.). У складзе Фэстывальнага Камітэту былі беларусы розных эміграцыйных „хваляў”. Некаторыя прыехалі ў ЗША толькі год-два таму, але былі й гэтакія, якіх ужо бацькі нарадзіліся ў Амэрыцы, а дзяды прыехалі ў ЗША перад Першай Сусьветнай вайной. З гэтага гледзішча фэстываль быў імпрэзай, якая яднала ў вадну сям’ю ўсіх тых, што шануюць і захоўваюць сваю беларускую культурна-нацыянальную спадчыну ды ёю ганарацца.

Праграма Трэцяга Фэстывалю, побач пунктаў стандартных для гэтых імпрэзаў, мела й шмат зусім новых высока мастацкіх нумароў. Беларуская песьня выконвалася на фэстывалі вэтэранам ужо беларускіх хораў у ЗША, жаночым ансамблям „Каліна” пад кіраўніцтвам кампазытара Барысаўца. Упоруч дэбютаваў, шырака ў штаце Огаё ведамы, жаночы ансамбль „Васількі” пад кіраўніцтвам сп. Кастуся Калоды, рэгенту царкоўнага хору беларускае царквы ў Кліўлендзе. Салістымі беларускае песьні — і народнае, і кампанаванае, — выступалі сп-ня Кацярына Яцэвіч, Ірэна Каляда-Сьмірнова, шырокаведамы тэнор Мікола Стрэчань ды асаблівы любімец беларускае грамады ў ЗША сп. Багдан Андрусьшын.

Беларускія танцы ў выдатнай харэаграфічнай апрацоўцы выконваліся ансамблямі й танцавальнымі гурткамі моладзі пад кіраўніцтвам заслужаных танцамайстроў і кіраўнікоў др. Алы Рамана й сп-ні Вілі Леўчук. Цалком новаю на фэстывалі была багатая музычная праграма ансамблю „Віхор”. Служачоў асабліва кранала з глыбокім пачуцьцём і выдатным майстэрствам выкананая на ксыляфоне Валерым Новакам „Перапёлка”. Першы раз выступаў і інструментальны квартэт „Палерма” з мэлэдыямі „Кветкі шчасьця” А. Туранкова, а таксама дуэт скрыпка-акордыён зь вязанкай беларускіх мэлэдыяў.

Зусім новаю ў праграме была мастацкая дэклімацыя, якая сымбалізавала сустрэчу беларусаў, новых імігрантаў, з сваімі суродзічамі-амэрыканцамі. Ад беларусаў новых, пад мэлэдыю „Люблю наш край”, сп-ня Сьвятлана Зарэчная дэклімавала верш Жэні Янішчыц „Край мой сіні, казка вясновая”. У адказ

на гэта, „амэрыканская” беларуска Вольга Лукашэвіч сказала верш беларускага паэты Сяргея Ясеня:

Land of forebears, of misty vision,
Ugly tyrants, and gracious song.
Bielaruś sends to us her pilgrims
With the message our roots are strong.

Welcome sisters and welcome brothers!
Take our friendship! Give your hand!
In America freedom flowers
With a blossom from every land!

Пасьля гэтага было зачытанае прывітаньне для фэстывалю ад суродзічаў з бацькаўшчыны. Завяршэньнем праграмы быў масавы танец „Пераплёт” — каля 60-х удзельнікаў. Фэстываль быў закончаны беларускім нацыянальным гімнам „Мы выйдзем шчыльнымі радамі” й малітваю „Божа блага-славі Амэрыку”, якія пяяла ўся аўдыторыя.

Улічаючы масавасьць грамадзкага ўдзелу, высокі ўзровень праграмы ды шырокі водгук у англамоўным пэрыядычным друку, у амэрыканскім радыё ды ў перадачах радыё „Свабода” й „Голас Амэрыкі”, Трэйці Беларускі Фэстываль трэба залічыць да вызначных культурных падзеяў у жыцьці беларусаў вольнага сьвету.

Вітаўт Кіпель
Старшыня Фэстывальнага Камітэту

ЗЬ БЕЛАРУСКАЕ НАВУКОВА-КУЛЬТУРНАЕ ХРОНІКІ 1979 ГОДУ

КАНФЭРЭНЦЫІ І РЭФЭРАТЫ

9 лютага Галіна Русак прачытала рэфэрат „Беларусь” — гісторыя, літаратура, мастацтва, этнаграфія” настаўнікам і вучням сярэдніх школаў акругі Саўт-Віндзор у штаце Нью Джэрзі. Рэфэрат быў ілюстраваны дыяпазытывамі пра беларускае народнае мастацтва, дэманстраваньнем пражы і тканьня, а таксама паказам беларускае вопраткі сябрамі Арганізацыі Беларускае Моладзі.

2 красавіка, на канфэрэнцыі бібліятэкароў у Чэрры Гіл штату Нью Джэрзі, др. Вітаўт Кіпель даў агляд калекцыяў кніжак у ангельскай мове пра нацыянальныя групы штату. Дакладней ён прааналізаваў калекцыі беларускіх кніжак і матар’ялаў пра Беларусь у большых бібліятэках штату, як Прынстанскага і Ратгерскага ўнівэрсытэтаў.

23-25 красавіка ў Нью Ёрку адбылася 33-я гадавая канфэрэнцыя Асацыяцыі Дасьледваньня Перахоўваньня і Апакаваньня Харчовых Прадуктаў для Войска, у працах якое браў удзел ды даў два рэфэраты і беларускі навуковец, ведамы спэцыяліст у галіне іррадыяцыі мясных прадуктаў, др. Аўген Вярбіцкі.

9 чэрвеня, на запросіны Беларускага Інстытуту Навукі і Мастацтва, а. Аляксандра Надсан, дырэктар Беларускае Бібліятэкі і Музэю імя Франьцішка Скарыны ў Лёндане, чытаў рэфэрат у Нью Ёрку пра „Асаблівасьці беларускага скорпісу 16-17 стагодзьдзя”. Айцец А. Надсан меў таксама рэфэрат у Інстытуце Ўкраінскіх Дасьледваньняў Гарвардзкага Ўнівэрсытэту.

10 ліпеня ў Кліўлендзе, штат Агаё, адбылася канфэрэнцыя на тэму „Нерасейскія народы супроць маскоўскага імперыялізму”. Арганізатарамі канфэрэнцыі былі Ўнівэрсытэт Джона Карроля, Асацыяцыя Вывучэньня Нацыянальных Праблемаў Сьвецкага Саюзу і Ўсходняе Эўропе ды Камітэт Паняволеных Народаў места Кліўленду. Ад беларусаў на канфэрэнцыі выступаў др. В. Кіпель. Кароткі зьмест ягонага рэфэрату пададзены ў газэце „Беларус”, нр 268, 1979 г.

15 верасня рэфэрат „Утварэньне Беларускае ССР” зрабіў у Беларускім Інстытуце Навукі й Мастацтва ў Нью Ёрку **Джэймс Дынглі**, прафэсар Рэдынгскага Ўнівэрсытэту ў Англіі. Рэфэрат быў абаснаваны на архіўных матар’ялах Міністэрства Замежных Справаў Англіі.

10-13 кастрычніка, на ведамым Ейльскім Унівэрсытэце ў Нью Гэвэн штату Канэктыкут, адбылася 11-я канфэрэнцыя Амэрыканскае Асацыяцыі Разьвіцьця Славяназнаўства, удзел у якой прыёмалі сябры Беларускага Інстытуту Навукі й Мастацтва. У сэкцыі эканамічнага раянаваньня СССР рэфэрат „Радовішчы соляў і нафты на Беларусі ды іхны ўплыў на эканоміку рэспублікі” чытаў **др. В. Кіпель**. Для сэкцыі адзначэньня 400-годзьдзя Віленскага Ўнівэрсытэту, кіраўніком якое быў прафэсар Часлаў Мілош, рэфэрат „Віленскі Ўнівэрсытэт у гісторыі беларускага народу” даў **др. Вітаўт Тумаш**. Скароты рэфэратаў надрукаваныя ў газэце „Беларус”, нр 271-272, лістапад-сьнежань 1979 г.

12 кастычніка, на запросіны Беларускага Інстытуту Навукі й Мастацтва, сп. **Гай дэ Пікарда** зь Лёндану, Англія, меў у Нью Ёрку рэфэрат „Царкоўная музыка ў беларускім нацыянальным адраджэньні”.

27 кастрычніка ў штатным Каледжы Эссэкс штату Мэрылэнд, адбылася канфэрэнцыя на тэму: „Нацыянальныя спадчыны й павышана езацікаўленьне этнічнымі групамі”. Беларускімі ўдзельнікамі канфэрэнцыі былі сп-ня **Зора Кіпель**, якая чытала рэфэрат „Мэтадалёгія апрацоўваньня даведнікавага матар’ялу пра нацыянальныя групы”, і **др. В. Кіпель**, рэфэрат якога быў на тэму: „Этнічнасьць, патрэбы дасьледваньня й рэсурсы”. Абодвы рэфэраты надрукаваныя ў кнізе: *Ethnic Heritages and Horizons: An Expanding Awareness*. Baltimore, Ethnic Affaires Committee, 1980.

24 лістапада, на навуковым паседжаньні Беларускага Інстытутоу Навукі й Мастацтва ў Нью Ёрку, рэфэрат „Купала-Коласава стагодзьдзе” чытаў прафэсар **Антон Адамовіч**.

ЛІТАРАТУРНЫЯ СУСТРЭЧЫ І ВЕЧАРЫ

20 студзеня ў Мэльбурне, Аўстралія, дзень паэзіі памяці паэты **Алеся Салаўя** быў зладжаны Беларускім Цэнтральным Камітэтам **Вікторыі**.

4 лютага, у Беларускай Бібліятэцы й Музэі імя Францішка Скарыны ў Лёндане, Англія, адбыўся літаратурны вечар, а разам і сустрэча беларускага пісьменьніка й літаратураведа **Аляксандры Баршчэўскага** з Польшчы зь беларускім грамадствам Лёндану й ваколіцаў.

28 красавіка, у **Украінскім Культурным Цэнтры Галівуду**, штат **Флярыда**, адбыўся літаратурны вечар беларускага паэты **Янкі Золака**. Апрача сваіх вершаў, паэта адчытаў і пераклады вершаў украінскага паэты **Леаніда Палтавы**.

27 травеня, пры нагодзе выхаду з друку кнігі выбранае паэзіі **Натальлі Арсеньневай „Між берагамі”**, **Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва** у **Ню Ёрку** ладзіў у гонар паэткі літаратурную бяседу.

6-7 кастрычніка, у праграме **Міжнацыянальнага Фэстывалю Нацыянальнае Спадчыны ў Ню Джэрзі**, разам з аглядам творчасці беларускіх паэтаў **ЗША**, быў адчытаны каля статуі **Свабоды** й верш у ангельскай мове паэты **Сяргея Ясеня**. Вёў праграму літаратурнага чытаньня **Дан Гэйлар**.

30 лістапада **Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва** арганізаваў у **Ню Ёрку** літаратурны вечар ведамае ангельскае паэткі й перакладніцы беларускае паэзіі **Веры Рыч**, аўтаркі ангельскае анталёгіі беларускае паэзіі **Like Water, Like Fire**.

БЕЛАРУСКІЯ ВЫСТАЎКІ

На працягу першае палавіны студзеня адбывалася, адкрытая яшчэ перад **Калядамі**, выстаўка беларускага этнічнага мастацтва ў **Галоўнай Кватэры Амэрыканскага Скаўтынгу ў Іст Браўнсвіку**. Мэта выстаўкі: паказаць вырабы народных умельцаў зьвязаныя з каляднай тэматыкай й калядныхя ўзоры на вышыўках ды багаты асартымэнт ялінкавых упрытожаньняў з нацыянальным арнамэнтам. Арганізатар выстаўкі — **Беларуска-Амэрыканская Арганізацыя Моладзі ў штаце Ню Джэрзі**.

Ад **18 сакавіка да 1 красавіка ў Беларускім Грамадскім Цэнтры ў Саўт Рывэры**, штат **Ню Джэрзі**, адбылася **6-я Гадавая Выстаўка беларускага народнага й прафэсійнага мастацтва** ды вырабаў беларускіх умельцаў. Арганізавала выстаўку **Беларускае Мастацкае й Навуковае Таварыства ў Саўт Рывэры**. Выстаўка, як і папярэднія, згуртавала колькі дзесятоў удзельнікаў — беларускіх умельцаў і мастакоў, а сярод іх шмат пачынаючых маладых. Асабліва падчыркнуць трэба павялічэньне ліку беларускіх мастакоў-фатаграфав, працы якіх выдатна ілюструюць і дакумэнтуюць беларускую спадчыну ў **Амэрыцы**.

Ад **21 красавіка да 16 травеня**, у ньюёрскай галэрэі **СОГО 20**, выстаўку сваіх новых абразоў мела **Галіна Русак**. У сьнежані ўдзел мастачка ўзяла і ў выстаўцы галэрэі **Пола Робэзона ў штатным Унівэрсытэце Ратгерс**.

29 красавіка адбылася выстаўка беларускіх народных тканінаў і пражы ў Даглас Каледжы штатнага Ўнівэрсытэту Ратгерс у Нью-Брансвіку.

Ад 20 травеня да 3 чэрвеня Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва ладзіў у Нью-Ёрку, у Беларускім Грамадскім і Рэлігійным Цэнтры, выстаўку твораў ведамага беларускага скульптара, маляра й графіка Парыжу **Міхася Наумовіча**. Асабліва шмат было на выстаўцы паказана новых акварэляў мастака, бальшыню якіх на выстаўцы наведвальнікі закупілі.

Ад 31 травеня да 3 чэрвеня ў сталіцы Канады, Атаве, адбыўся першы міжнацыянальны „Фэстываль Бацькаўшчынаў”, актыўны ўдзел у якім узялі й беларусы ды мелі на фэстывалі й свой павілён. Цэнтральнае месца ў павілёне займалі пано з нашымі стылізаванымі беларускімі жаночымі народнымі касцюмамі ды, на фоне вялікае карты Беларусі, палотнішчы з гэрбамі беларускіх местаў і ваяводзтваў. У выстаўцы ўзяло ўдзел больш за 20 народных умельцаў з сваімі вышыўкамі, інкрустацыямі, разьбой; была й мастацкая фатаграфія. Зь беларускіх прафэсійных мастакоў удзел у выстаўцы ўзялі Івонка Сурвіла ды Міхась Наумовіч. Беларускі каардынатарамі фэстывалю й выстаўкі былі сябры Беларускага Інстытуту Навукі й Мастацтва ў Канадзе — Івонка Сурвіла (старшыня), др. Раіса Жук-Грышкевіч і сп. Янка Сурвіла.

17 чэрвеня, у штатным каледжы акругі Мідлсэкс штату Нью-Джэрзі, была арганізаваная 5-я Гадавая выстаўка народнага мастацтва ды мастацкіх твораў умельцаў зь Беларусі, якія былі прывезеныя імігрантамі. Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва меў таксама выстаўку беларускіх публікацыяў у ангельскай мове, пераважна кніжак. Апрача Беларускага Інстытуту, удзел у выстаўцы ўзялі Беларуска-Амэрыканскае Задзіночаньне й Беларуска-Амэрыканская Арганізацыя Моладзі.

21 ліпеня, уяршыню ў сталіцы ЗША Вашынгтоне, у Будынку Канстытуцыі каля Белага Дому, з нагоды Тыдня Паняволеных Народаў адбылася вялікая выстаўка народнага мастацтва ды прафэсійных мастакоў паняволеных народаў. Беларуская выстаўка займала траціну паўднённага-ўсходняга крыла будынку дг складалася галоўна з народных ткацкіх і інкрустацыйных вырабаў розных раёнаў Беларусі, уключна зь Беласточчынай і Смаленшчынай. У цэнтры выстаўкі, на адмысловым уладжаньні, выдзяляўся алейны абраз Пётры Мірановіча „Беларускія імігранты”, які асабліва зацікавіў

як журналістгх, так і наведвальнікаў. У арганізацыі выстаўкі ўзялі ўдзел Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва, Беларуска-Амэрыканскае Задзіночаньне ды Беларуска-Амэрыканская Арганізацыя Моладзі Амэрыкі.

З канца ліпеня да 15 верасьня ў Нью Ёрку, у Міжнародным Цэнтры фатаграфіі, былі паказаныя працы мастака-фатаграфа з Заходняй Беларусі Яна Булгака. Працы Я. Булгака сустрэлі вельмі прыхільную ацэну амэрыканскіх крытыкаў.

6-7 кастрычніка, у Парку Свабоды штату Нью Джэрзі, адбылася выстаўка беларускага народнага мастацтва ды англамоўнае літаратуры пра Беларусь. Дэманстравалася таксама сп-няй Надзеяй Кудасавай — паказаная й на тэлебачаньні — пража на верацянне лёну.

10-13 кастрычніка, падчас 11-е Канфэрэнцыі Амэрыканскае Асацыяцыі Разьвіцьця Славяназнаўства, якая адбылася ў Нью Гэвэне штату Канэктыкут, Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва, у супрацоўніцтве з Аддзелам Беларуска-Амэрыканскага Задзіночаньня ў тым штаце, ладзіў выстаўку беларускага друку ў Амэрыцы, пераважна кніжак.

15-21 кастрычніка, у часе Тыдня Славянскіх Культураў у Нью Ёрку, адбывалася выстаўка й беларускага народнага мастацтва з дэманстраваньнем сп-няй Н. Кудасавай пражы лёну. На выстаўцы-ж прафэсійных мастакоў былі паказаныя творы й беларускіх мастакоў — Пётры Мірановіча, Ірэны Рагалевіч, Галіны Русак, Івонкі Сурвіла-Шыманец, Ст. Тамары, Язэпа Казьлякоўскага.

3-4 лістапада, як і папярэднімі гадамі, Беларускі Каардынацыйны Камітэт места Чыкага, у які ўваходзяць арганізацыі Згуртаваньня Беларусаў штату Ілліной, Беларуская Нацыянальная Рада ў Чыкага ды Арганізацыя Беларуска-Амэрыканскае Моладзі штату Ілліной, браў удзел у міжнацыянальнай выстаўцы ў Чыкага. Былі паказаныя галоўна народныя вырабы, вопратка, ды дэманстраваліся сп-няй Барбарай Шуст і сп. Міколам Шустам тэхніка інкрустацыі, а сп-няй Кацярынай Кайгатцу тканьня.

В. Кіпель

Зьмест артыкулаў пабеларуску.

ВІТАЎТ ТУМАШ. 25 гадоў дзейнасьці Беларускага Інстытуту Навукі й Мастацтва. б. 9-14. Беларускі Інстытут Навукі й Мастацтва быў заснаваны 16 студзеня 1951 г. ў Нью Ёрку ды паставіў за сваю мэту згрупаваць беларускіх навукоўцаў, дасьледнікаў беларусаведы ды беларускіх пісьменьнікаў, мастакоў і артыстаў, якія ў выніку падзеяў другое сусьветнае вайны апынуліся за межамі Бацькаўшчыны. Інстытут быў залегалізаваны як Беларуска-Амэрыканская Навукова-Дасьледчая Установа ды разгарнуў сваю дзейнасьць як у Злучаных Штатах, гэтак і паза Амэрыкай. Філіі Інстытуту былі арганізаваныя ў Заходняй Нямеччыне ў 1955 г. ды ў Канадзе ў 1967 г. Дзейнасьць Інстытуту адбываецца ў колькіх кірунках: арганізоўваюцца навуковыя зборкі, на якіх чытаюцца рэфэраты, сябры Інстытуту бяруць удзел у розных міжнацыянальных канфэрэнцыях, а таксама Інстытут як партнэр ды самастойна ладзіць канфэрэнцыі зь беларусаведы, ды шырока праводзіць праграму выставак мастацкіх і беларусаведных.

За 25 гадоў дзейнасьці Інстытут зладзіў у Нью Ёрку 202 навуковыя зборкі, на якіх было прачытана 180 рэфэратаў, а разам зь філіямі Нямецкай і Канадзкай — 239 рэфэратаў. Апрача гэтага сябрамі Інстытуту былі прачытаныя яшчэ каля 200 рэфэратаў на міжнацыянальных канфэрэнцыях. Інстытут гэтаксама арганізаваў 10 мастацкіх выставак ды 6 выставак зь беларускае культуры. Ад 1952 г. Інстытут выдае „Запісы”, а ў годах 1954-63 друкаваліся „Конадні” — літаратурна-мастацкі часопіс. Манаграфічныя выданьні Інстытуту й сяброў яго налічваюць колькі дзесяткоў. Сёньняшні профіль спэцыялізацыі Інстытуту-Скарынаведа, новая беларуская гісторыя-пэрыяд БНР ды яйна дзейнасьць, сучасная беларуская літаратура ды беларусіка паза БССР.

ІВОНКА СУРВІЛА. Дзейнасьць Канадзкае Філіі Беларускага Інстытуту Навукі й Мастацтва. б. 15-16. Філія заснаваная ў 1967 годзе. Апрача рэфэратаў найбольшыя імпрэзы, ладжаныя Інстытутам, былі гэтакія: адзначэньне 450-х угодкаў беларускага друку, 2 канфэрэнцыі беларусаведы: ў 1971 г. супольна з Квінс-Унівэрсыты ў г. Кінгстоне, а ў 1975 г. супольна з Атаўскім Унівэрсытэтам ў сталіцы Канады Атаве, ды шэраг выставак.

СТАНІСЛАЎ СТАНКЕВІЧ. Забароненыя творы Купалы. б. 17-26. Разгляд трох паваенных выданняў збораў твораў Я. Купалы ды стаўленьне да іх савецкае цэнзуры. У першае выданьне, 1952-1954, ня было падана каля 160 твораў, у другім выданьні, 1961-1963, неставала панад 50 твораў, а ў выданьні 1972-1976 гадоў ня ўлучана панад 50 твораў. Прычыны цэнзуры ды „праблема ачышчэньня” Купалавых твораў ад культу асобы-праблемы, завойстранае П. Броўкам на Пленуме Саюзу Пісьменьнікаў БССР у 1962 годзе.

ВОЛЬГА АРЭХВА. Тры гістарычныя паэмы Я. Купалы. б. 27-30. Разгляд паэмаў „Курган”, „Бандароўна” і „Магіла Льва”. Імкненьне Купалы праз мастацкія вобразы, спалучаючы гістарычныя падзеі й народную творчасць, усьведаміць народ у беларускай гісторыі.

АНТОН АДАМОВІЧ. Праблема пачаткаў беларускай літаратуры. б. 31-34. Першы нацыянальны гісторык беларускай літаратуры Максім Гарэцкі пачынаў гісторыю беларускае літаратуры ад пачаткаў пісьменства ў „царкоўнаславянскай” мове („царкоўна-славяншчыны”), так ці інакш зьвязанага зь Беларусяй. Тым-жа часам прафэсар Я. Карскі, а за ім М. Дабрынін, В. Вольскі ды іншыя сучасныя савецкія аўтары пачынаюць гэтую гісторыю ад памятак у беларускай мове, хоць Вольскі й іншыя савецкія аўтары стараюцца так ці інакш увесці ў яе й царкоўна-славянскія памяткі.

ЯН САДОЎСКІ. Дасьледваньні аб Францішку Скарыну па другой сусьветнай вайне на Захадзе. б. 35-42. Дакумэнтальна-бібліяграфічны аналіз важнейшых адкрыцьцяў і удакладненьняў у дзейнасьці й творчасці Ф. Скарыны, як прыкладам устанаўленьне новае даты пачатку друку ў Вільні ў 1522 годзе, Скарынаў пабыт у Даніі, Падуі, Брэславе і інш.

ЮРЫ ШЭВЯЛЁЎ. Праблема супольнага беларуска-украінскага фаналягічнага разьвіцьця. б. 43-46. Аналіз супольных характэрных асаблівасьцяў фаналягічнага разьвіцьця беларускае і украінскае моваў ды храналягічнае датаваньне іх.

РАІСА ЖУК-ГРЫШКЕВІЧ. Беларускае выяўленчае мастацтва на Захадзе. б. 47-62. Разгляд творчасці беларускіх мастакоў, ілюстратараў ды скульптараў ў Злучаных Штатах, Канадзе, Аўстраліі ды Зах. Эўропе. Храналягічны пералік выставак, багатыя біяграфічныя дадзеныя аб мастакох.

УЛАДЗІМЕР ШЫМАНЕЦ. Мастакі зь Беларусі: Парыская Школа. б. 63-68. Разгляд творчасці сямёх выдатных заснавальнікаў Парыскае Школы, якія паходзяць зь Беларусі:

Марка Шагала зь Віцебску, Хаіма Сутыны зь Сьмілавічаў, Пінкуса Крэменя з Жалудка, каля Ліды, Сымона Сегалю зь Белаастоку, Ботына Задкіна з Смаленшчыны, Жака Ліпшыца з Друзгенікаў ды Міхала Кікойна з Рэчыцы. Сувязь зь Беларусяй у жыцці й творчасці гэтых мастакоў.

ГАЛІНА РУСАК. Сучаснае беларускае мастацтва. б. 69-81. Разгляд тэматыкі творчасці ды тэхнікі працы мастакоў БССР. Аналіз зместу вобразаў ды, там, дзе магчыма, параўнаньні мастакоў.

ДЫМІТРЫ ВЕРАСАЎ. Беларуская музыка ў Злучаных Штатах. б. 82-84. Разгляд дзейнасьці й творчасці беларускіх кампазытараў, хормайстраў ды дырыгэнтаў у Злучаных Штатах. Новыя беларускія музыкальныя творы ды магчымыя кірункі далейшае дзейнасьці беларускіх музыкантаў на Захадзе.

ПАТРЫША КЭННЭДЫ ГРЫМСТЭД. Архівы ды зборы манускрыптаў у Беларускай ССР. б. 85-102. Цяжкасьці й перашкоды ў вывучэньні архіўных сховішчаў Беларусі — найперш безьліч адміністрацыйных пераменаў, перавозаў ды вывазаў архіўных матар'ялаў. Апісаньне архіўных сховішчаў БССР.

ПАТРЫША КЭННЭДЫ ГРЫМСТЭД. Беларускія геаграфічныя назвы. б. 103-112. Слоўнік беларускіх геаграфічных назваў з польска-расейскімі эквівалентамі ды заўвагі аб існуючых правапісных правілах перадачы беларускіх геаграфічных назваў.

ВІТАЎТ КІПЕЛЬ. Раньняя прысутнасьць беларусаў у Амэрыцы. б. 113-131. Аналіз прычынаў чаму беларусы траплялі ў іншыя рубрыкі: пераважна расейскую ды польскую — у часе іміграцыі ды перапісаў жыхарства. Беларусь як апырычнае культурнае паняцьце ў амэрыканскай літаратуры.

ЯНКА ЗАПРУДНІК. Савецкая дакумэнтацыя гісторыі Беларусі (1902-1919 гг.). б. 132-143. Аналіз савецкіх дакумэнтальных выданьняў паказвае, што ў іх ігнаруюцца дакумэнты, у якіх адлюстраваная гісторыя беларускіх небальшавіцкіх партыяў, а таксама культурны аспект у гісторыі беларускіх большавіцкіх плыняў. Бяз гэткае дакумэнтацыі нельга належа прасачыць станаўленьня ідэі беларускае дзяржаўнасьці, зараджэньне якое адбылося ўнутры небальшавіцкіх партыяў, але якую большавікі адаптавалі пасля, у 1918 г., да сваіх палітычных плянаў.

ТОМАС Э. БЭРД. Праваслаўе ў Беларусі: 1917-1980. б. 144-208. Шлях да абвешчання аўтакефаліі Беларускае Праваслаўнае Царквы ў Менску ў 1922 г., ейнае разьвіцьцё ды пагляды Патрыярха Ціхана на царкоўныя падзеі 1920-х гадоў у Беларусі. Ліст Патрыярха Ціхана ўраду БНР. Аднаўленьне аўтакефаліі ў 1927-ым і 1942-ім гадох. Праваслаўная Беларуская Царква ў Польшчы. Структура й дзейнасьць Беларускае Праваслаўнае Царквы паза Беларусяй. Сьпісы епархіяў, першарархаў БПЦ, ды япіскапаў БАПЦ. Пераклады статутаў і іншых дакумэнтаў.

ВАЛЕНТЫНА ПАШКЕВІЧ. Навучаньне беларускае мовы ў англамоўным асяроддзі. б. 209-213. Разгляд мэтадалёгіі й праграмаў беларускіх школаў у Амэрыцы й Канадзе. Праблемы падручнікаў і дапасаваньня тэматыкі матар'ялу для вучняў з англамоўнага асяроддзя.

ВАСІЛЬ МЕЛЬЯНОВІЧ. Беларусаведа ў сярэдніх школах і двухгадовых каледжах штату Мэрыленд. б. 214-218. Разгляд і ацэна праграмаў для падручнікаў, празь якія даюцца англамоўным вучням веды пра Беларусь.

УЛАДЗІМЕР БРЫЛЕЎСКІ. Польскі замежны друк пра Беларусь. б. 219-226. Артыкул у беларускай мове.

З Ь М Е С Т

Ад рэдактара	5
Вітаўт Кіпель. Уступное слова	7
Вітаўт Тумаш. 25 гадоў дзейнасці БІНМ ў ЗША	9
Івонка Суавіла. Дзейнасць Канадзкае Філіі БІНМ	15
Станіслаў Станкевіч. Забароненыя творы Купалы	17
Вольга Арэхва. Тры гістарычныя паэмы Я. Купалы	27
Антон Адамовіч. Праблема пачаткаў беларускай літаратуры	31
Ян Садоўскі. Даследванні аб Ф. Скарыну па другой сусветнай вайне на Захадзе	35
Юры Шэвялёў. Праблема супольнага беларуска-украінскага фаналегічнага развіцця	43
Раіса Жук-Грышкевіч. Беларускае выяўленчае мастацтва на Захадзе	47
Уладзімер Шыманец. Мастакі зь Беларусі: Парыская Школа	63
Галіна Русак. Сучаснае беларускае мастацтва	69
Дымітры Верасаў. Беларуская музыка ў Злучаных Штатах	82
Патрыша Кэннэды Грымстэд. Архівы ды зборы манускрыптаў у Беларускай ССР	85
Патрыша Кэннэды Грымстэд. Беларускія геаграфічныя назовы	103
Вітаўт Кіпель. Раньнія прысутнасць беларусаў у Амэрыцы	113
Янка Запруднік. Савецкая дакумэнтацыя гісторыі Беларусі (1902-1919 гг.)	132
Томас Э. Бэрд. Праваслаўе ў Беларусі: 1917-1980	144
Валентына Пашкевіч. Навучаньне беларускае мовы ў англамоўным асяродзьдзі	209
Васіль Мельяновіч. Беларусаведа ў сярэдніх школах і двухгадовых каледжах штату Мэрылэнд	214
Уладзімер Брылеўскі. Польскі замежны друк пра Беларусь	219
Рэцэнзій	227
Хроніка	239

